

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Bruce Jeffrey Groll for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Postsecondary and Technological Education presented on
May 7, 1992.

Title: An Anonymous Screening Process for Selecting the Most
Qualified Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract approved:

Henry J. Sredl

The purpose of this study was to design an objective-based Anonymous Screening Process (ASP) for selecting the most qualified finalists for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education. The intent was to design a viable employment process that substantially meets equal opportunity mandates, the dual aim of the Federal government's affirmative action efforts to eliminate the discriminatory effects of the past and to bar future discrimination, and the goal of the U.S. Congress of improving the economic status of disabled individuals by removing discriminatory barriers to full employment.

An anonymous screening process is part of a comprehensive employment process, including recruitment, application, evaluation, and selection, wherein an applicant's name, race, religion, color, sex, age, handicap, and institutional identify are unknown to all persons

involved in the process through selection of the most qualified finalists.

An anonymous applicant screening process will minimize evaluator bias, effectively eliminate the interjection of non-objective criteria from external sources in selecting the most qualified finalists, and provide a defensible basis for using protected class status in the final selection as an additional criterion in situations of underrepresentation.

Copyright by Bruce Jeffrey Groll
May 7, 1992

All Rights Reserved

An Anonymous Screening Process
for Selecting the Most Qualified Finalists in
Administrative Employment Searches

by

Bruce Jeffrey Groll

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed May 7, 1992

Commencement June 1992

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Postsecondary and Technological Education in
charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Chair of Department of Postsecondary and Technological
Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of College of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented May 7, 1992

Typed by Bruce J. Groll

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is dedicated to those individuals whose courageous pilgrimage for human equity, personal integrity, and educational excellence have taken them down the road less traveled--sometimes at great personal risk--in pursuit of a better way.

There is a long list of truly exceptional individuals to whom I owe a great debt of gratitude for giving unconditionally to me their heartfelt support, encouragement, and inspiration. With all my heart, thank you for making this milestone possible.

Infinite thanks to my parents, Donald H. and Gloria R. Groll, and my uncle, Joseph Nankin, whose love and encouragement have been the inspirational forces behind my eternal quest of a higher education; to my daughter, Tiara Rose Groll, in whose extraordinary mind I am entrusted to instill a respect for life, an appreciation of diversity and the virtues of a comprehensive education, and inspire a desire to explore the wondrous opportunities and meet the challenges that our future may hold; to Tuula Maija Tyry, whose love, support, worldly knowledge, and dedication to the pursuit of excellence has both inspired and reinforced my personal desire to excel; and to my lifelong friends and confidants, Paul A. Gossett and Dr. Porter B. Lombard, whose companionship, compassion, and mutual admiration guided me through some difficult, albeit rewarding, challenges.

Special thanks to Professor Henry J. Sredl, and the other members of my doctoral committee, whose mentorship, guidance, support, and incredible energy level sustained my momentum and focus for timely completion of this research; to Deborah K. Safley for meticulously editing and transforming the Bibliography into APA format; and to the ex-officio advisors and Delphi without whom the development of the Anonymous Screening Process would not have been creditable. In particular, to Everett Wells, whose friendship, mentorship, professional expertise, and personal counsel contributed significantly to the outcome of process.

Lastly, to those extraordinary administrators at Oregon State University, whose leadership and dedication to the basic principles of equal opportunity inspired this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: Introduction to the Study	1
Overview	1
Background	3
Purpose of the Study	13
Importance of the Study	15
Definitions	17
CHAPTER II: Review of the Literature	21
Scope of the Study	21
Support for the Study	23
Steps in the Traditional Employment Process	30
Flow of the Traditional Employment Process	30
Position Development	32
Recruitment	34
Application	35
Evaluation	37
Selection	38
Testing, Interviewing, and Hiring	40
Testing (Optional)	40
Interviewing	41
Hiring	41

The Essential Elements of the Applicant	
Screening Process	43
Institution	43
Position Description	43
Public Notice or Advertisement	44
Affirmative Action Data Form	44
Applicant	45
Letter of Application	45
Professional Resume or Vita	46
CHAPTER III: Methodology	47
Design of the Study	47
The "Traditional" Employment Process and	
Identification of the Essential Elements	54
The Delphi Method	54
Selecting the Delphi Panelists	55
Preliminary Design of the Anonymous Screening	
Process	58
Compilation and Analysis of the Anonymous	
Screening Process	60
Sources of Data	60
Modification of the Design of the Anonymous	
Screening Process	62

CHAPTER IV: Results	64
Composition of the Process Development Team	64
Delphi Panelists	64
Ex-Officio Advisors	68
The "Traditional" Employment Process	70
The Essential Elements of the Applicant	
Screening Process	71
Suggestions, Criticisms, and Comments	73
Suggestions for Modifying and Enhancing the	
Process	73
Constructive Criticisms	80
Contemplative Comments	82
General Comments	82
Supportive Comments	83
Provocative Comments	84
The Anonymous Screening Process (ASP)	86
Position Development	87
Position Analysis	87
Position Description	88
Search Committee Appointment and Training	89
Appointment	89
Training	90
Recruitment	91

Application	93
Instructions	93
Letter of Application	93
Professional Resume or Vita	94
Application/Personal Data Form	95
Evaluation	96
Primary (Initial) Applicant Evaluation	96
Secondary Applicant Evaluation	97
Tertiary Applicant Evaluation	98
Selection of the Most Qualified Finalists	100
Provisional	100
Selection	100
Notification and Confirmation	101
On-Site Interview	102
Final Selection	102
Supporting Documents	104
Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process	105
 CHAPTER V: Discussion	 107
General Discussion of the Results	107
Limitations	107
Biases and Prejudices of the Delphi	110
Conclusions	114
Goals and Objectives	114
Implications	115
Specific Implications	115

Recommendations and Future Research	117
Recommendations	117
Implement the Anonymous Screening Process	117
Survey the Participants	117
Future Research	117
Assessment of General Perceptions	118
 CHAPTER VI: Bibliography	 120
 APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Delphi Panel Information Packet	129
Letter to Project Advisors	130
Letter of Introduction	131
Memorandum of Acceptance to Participate	132
Dissertation Prospectus	133
Delphi Panelist Instructions	144
Delphi Panel Questionnaire	146
 Appendix B: Four-Year Public Western Colleges and Universities With Student Head Count Greater Than 5,000	 159
 Appendix C: Memorandum of Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process	 161

Appendix D: Delphi Panel Questionnaire Results	163
Applicant Information Matrix 1	164
Applicant Information Matrix 2	165
Appendix E: The Anonymous Screening Process	166
Position Description	167
Notice of Position Vacancy	171
Application Instructions	172
Letter of Application	173
Professional Resume	183
Application/Personal Data Form	185
Evaluation Form	187
Criteria Matrix	188
Multiple Factor Tertiary Matrix	189
Appendix F: Assessment of the Anonymous Screening Process	190
Assessment of the Anonymous Screening Process	191
Letter of Informed Consent	194
Professional Assessment of the Anonymous Screening Process	195

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Traditional and Optional Steps in the Employment Process	31
2. Procedural Steps of the Study	49
Phase I	49
Phase II	50
Phase III	51
Phase IV	52
Phase V	53

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Composition of the Delphi	67
2. Composition of the Ex-Officio Advisors	69
3. Summary of the Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process	105
4. Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process	106

AN ANONYMOUS SCREENING PROCESS FOR SELECTING THE MOST QUALIFIED FINALISTS IN ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYMENT SEARCHES

CHAPTER I

Introduction to the Study

Overview

The purpose of this study was to design an objective-based Anonymous Screening Process (ASP) for selecting the most qualified finalists for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education. The intent was to design a viable employment process that substantially meets equal opportunity mandates, the dual aim of the Federal government's affirmative action efforts to eliminate the discriminatory effects of the past and to bar future discrimination, and the goal of the U.S. Congress of improving the economic status of disabled individuals by removing discriminatory barriers to full employment.

An anonymous screening process is part of a comprehensive employment process, including recruitment, application, evaluation, and selection, wherein an applicant's name, race, religion, color, sex, age, handicap, and institutional identity are unknown to all persons involved in the process. An anonymous applicant screening process will minimize evaluator bias, effectively eliminate the interjection of non-objective criteria from external sources in selecting the most qualified finalists, and provide a defensible basis for using protected class status

in the final selection as an additional criterion in situations of underrepresentation.

The results of this study will be recommended for implementation at selected public universities and for evaluation in terms of the perceived fairness and objectivity in evaluating and selecting finalists using the anonymous screening process as compared with current applicant screening processes.

Background

A lack of understanding and non-compliance with the law as it relates to affirmative action and equal opportunity in employment continues to plague American higher education (Weatherspoon, 1991; Tatel & Mincberg, 1989; Arvey & Faley, 1988). While the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution's Fourteenth Amendment applies generally to employment discrimination by public institutions, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 specifically states that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to discriminate against or deprive of employment opportunities any individual because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 extends the provisions of Title VII to cover both public and private educational institutions (Kaplin, 1989). The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 mandates that all employers with greater than fifteen workers must accurately define the "essential functions" of all jobs and rewrite position descriptions to ensure that physical, mental and communication requirements are job related (Weatherspoon, 1991; Hunsicker, 1990).

The traditional applicant screening process for non-tenured administrative employment typically reveals institution and applicant names, gender, and potentially, race, ethnic background, age, and handicap. As a result of

these revelations, the traditional screening process is highly susceptible to personal bias, the interjection of non-objective criteria, and undue influence from internal and external sources. The traditional employment process, in contradiction to the fundamental principle of equal protection, has given rise to litigious Title VII claims of disparate treatment of individuals and disparate or adverse impact upon classes of persons.

In deference to documented current and historical adverse outcomes of the traditional employment process, surprisingly little has been done to evaluate or redesign the employment *process* itself to minimize bias. Consequently, bias and unlawful discrimination (the use of negative, exclusionary or limiting quotas) in the traditional employment process continue to occur. Intent notwithstanding, we all possess inherent biases that influence our decisions (Taylor, 1989); and no matter what a person's racial or ethnic background, gender, or employment status few are free from a plethora of prejudices about groups other than their own (Fernandez, 1991).

Although federal and state civil rights and affirmative action legislation have been passed to mitigate these biases in the employment process, and public institutions of higher education have implemented specific policies skillfully articulated to address the same (Kaplin, 1989), the traditional process remains seriously flawed.

Affirmative action mandates by Executive Order that public higher education institutions recruit qualified minority and women applicants to obtain demographically representative candidate pools (Day, Erwin, & Koral, 1978). However, once the screening process is underway, each candidate must be evaluated based on job-related criteria regardless of group membership (Stanford University, 1987).

University policies and procedures have been promulgated to ensure that "all applicants receive fair consideration for employment on the basis of appropriate job related criteria without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin or handicap" (Oregon State University, 1991, p. 4).

These measures have been only marginally effective in expanding the applicant pool, but ineffectual in depreciating inherent biases in the traditional evaluation and selection processes (Weatherspoon, 1991; Hitt, 1982). As American Council on Education Senior Scholar Dr. Reginald Wilson so succinctly states in response to the rhetorical question, "Did complex and burdensome executive orders, laws, and court decisions result in institutionalized practices which would perpetuate and maintain equal opportunity . . .," "The answer is, tragically, no." (Wilson, 1989, p. 3).

Employment practices in higher education are often inconsistent with the law as colleges and universities

struggle to balance institutional employment needs and social policy to achieve a multicultural environment. Multiculturalism is an understanding of and appreciation for the ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity that encompasses our American heritage (Ravitch, 1990). It is critical that higher education meets its moral and ethical obligation to promote an atmosphere of multiculturalism from the pluralist, as opposed to the particularist, perspective (Ravitch, 1990), with an emphasis on equity and objectivity, and with an attitude of acceptance and inclusiveness. But it must be done fairly, drawing upon the job-related strengths and experiences of the individual (Hill, 1989). "Search committees, asked to respond not only to non-discrimination concerns but also to diversity initiatives, continued to be stymied by these (seemingly) contradictory demands" (Montoya, 1991, p. 7).

An attitudinal study of college and university administrators was conducted by Sisneros (1984) to examine perceptions about "minority preference." The results generally indicate perceptions of excessive preferential treatment for minorities among the white respondents and negative personal effects (e.g., competence, self-esteem, value of contributions) among the minority respondents. These results were supported in a more recent study of faculty attitudes about affirmative action conducted by Smith and Sneed (1989). They found, among white male and

female respondents, that in the initial faculty selection there is a perception of a distinct advantage to being a minority.

Similar perceptions among white American youths of preferential treatment for minorities have fueled pessimistic attitudes about race relations and aroused resentment of affirmative action programs (Collison, 1992).

The pressures for social reform without procedural reform of the applicant screening process have tended to exacerbate the problem of bias, and have portended increased racial and ethnic tensions on campuses across the U.S. (Kalantzis & Cope, 1989).

The traditional applicant screening process for evaluating and selecting the pool of most qualified finalists is a "double-edged sword." Screening committee members may intentionally discriminate affirmatively on the basis of gender or race as per external directives but may also be compelled by greater personal biases and stereotypes to discriminate against these same persons (Johnson, 1989; Leedom, 1989; Singer & Sewell, 1989; Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Cleveland, 1985; Couch, 1981). An employment study released in July 1991, by The Urban Institute of Washington, D.C., concludes that job discrimination (against blacks) "is entrenched and widespread" (Turnex, Fix, & Struyk, 1991, p. 61). Moreover, the study found that white job applicants faced discriminatory practices seven percent of the time.

Educator and author Larissa Grunig writes that in higher education, there is "...a pattern of bias, misunderstanding and insensitivity" resulting in the disparate treatment of women in hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions (Grunig, 1989, p. 99). Charanne Clarke of Duke University and Barbara Taylor of the University of Arkansas echo her sentiments of "...the current overbalance of males in senior administrative positions resulting from past discriminatory hiring practices" (Clarke, 1988, p. 50), and the "...increasing numbers of well-qualified women has not been matched by similar growth in women faculty and administrators" (Taylor, 1989, p. 27), respectively. Spivak (1988) writes of how increased emphasis on differences that continually focus on minorities and women at the margins of society, tends to reinforce and perpetuate that marginality.

Affirmative action was initiated to remedy the effects of past discrimination by means of an active program (Stanford University, 1987). However, in an effort to make up for past inequities, some institutions have used racial, ethnic or gender preference prior to an objectively-based selection of the most qualified finalists in attempting to balance their multicultural needs. These actions are coming under increasing scrutiny, criticism and legal challenge (Cahn, 1989; Lee, 1989; Scott, 1989; Arvey & Faley, 1988). Affirmative action supports assigning positive weight to protected class status as a criterion when filling a

traditionally segregated position (Lessow-Hurley, 1989) after a pool of objectively evaluated applicants is selected, a bona fide determination of manifest imbalance has been made, and there exists a minority or woman candidate among the most qualified finalists (Kaplin, 1989).

A different approach to screening applicants is critically needed in public higher education to ensure equal opportunity and objectivity in the administrative employment process (Dale, 1987). The development of an anonymous screening process for public higher education to be used in the initial evaluation of applicants and selection of the most qualified finalists will substantially ensure that all candidates are evaluated equitably and objectively on the basis of essential job-related criteria explicitly stated in the job announcement and position description. In a conceptual review of the proposed anonymous screening process Kathryn Wells Murdock, Director of Legal Services for the Oregon Department of Education, concludes that "...the anonymous process may effectively counter allegations of disparate impact." Recent court opinions have affirmed institutions' defense of documented job-relatedness to rebut the *prima facie* showing of discrimination (Hill, 1989).

An anonymous screening process will facilitate equal opportunity mandates and the dual aim of the Federal government's affirmative action efforts to: 1) "...eliminate

the discriminatory effects of the past" by providing a legitimate objective-based process for selecting the most qualified finalists wherein race or sex may be used in the final selection as an additional criterion in situations of underrepresentation and 2) "...bar future discrimination" by ensuring, to the greatest degree practicable, the availability of an alternative employment process that is free of the inherent biases of the traditional employment process (Committee on Labor & Human Resources, 1982, p. 58). Furthermore, an anonymous screening process will substantially meet the requirements of Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 by ensuring that the selection procedure is based on legitimate, job-related requirements and standards.

The model for such a process might parallel the one used by professional journals and conference committees for selection of professional papers for publication or presentation. The paper is submitted with a cover letter including the author's name and social security number; only the cover page identifies the author by name; the paper contains only the author's social security number; the screening committee individually ranks each paper on the basis of the stated objective criteria; and consensus among the committee as to the finalists selected is reached through open discussion (Association for Institutional Research, 1990).

A similar anonymous applicant screening process in higher education could be designed and implemented that facilitates objective applicant evaluations based on the specified job-related criteria in the position description without interjecting potentially biasing references to or indications of the applicant's gender, race, age, or handicap during the initial evaluation and in the selection of the most qualified finalists. Additionally, careful scrutiny of seemingly neutral criteria such as educational institutions attended, employers, and professional group affiliations must be exercised to assure culturally biased attitudes are not subsumed (Montoya, 1991).

The anonymous applicant screening process would benefit all applicants by ensuring objectivity in evaluation and providing opportunity for legitimate consideration of protected class status after having established a finalist pool of the most qualified candidates.

The legitimate societal need for affirmative action plans that support proactive efforts to recruit qualified minority and women candidates to obtain a demographically representative balance in the workplace clearly exists. Implementation of affirmative action plans as mandated by Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 provides postsecondary institutions an opportunity to use protected class status (e.g., woman or minority) as a legitimate criterion for filling a position (Etcherson & Conyers, 1989). "In an

increasingly diverse population, our educational institutions must reflect and respond to cultural diversity" (Lessow-Hurley, 1989, p. 22).

An anonymous screening process will facilitate national educational affirmative action goals and socioeconomic reforms by providing a diverse pool of "equally" qualified finalists whereafter protected class status may be considered as legitimate additional criteria in the final selection in environments of underrepresentation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to design an objective-based anonymous applicant screening process for selecting the most qualified finalists for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education.

The results of this study yielded an objective-based anonymous applicant screening process for selecting the most qualified finalists for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education that facilitates equal employment opportunity and affirmative action mandates and socioeconomic reforms. This process offers public institutions of higher education an *alternative* applicant screening procedure that minimizes evaluator bias, effectively eliminates the interjection of non-objective criteria by external sources into the selection of the most qualified finalists, and substantially ensures equal opportunity and objective consideration to all candidates. The objective-based screening process may be generalized for use in other employment categories and by other educational organizations.

The research questions that were addressed are:

1. What are the major information items that comprise the traditional employment process?

2. What are the essential elements that public institutions must include in any employment process which are absolutely necessary or legally required?
3. How can the traditional employment process and essential elements be modified to create an anonymous screening process that substantially ensures fairness and objectivity in recruiting, evaluating, and selecting the most qualified finalists?

Importance of the Study

This empirical study was helpful in describing the critical need for a different approach to screening applicants and in envisioning what that approach must include to assure equal opportunity and objectivity in the administrative employment evaluation and selection processes. When implemented in public higher education as a management tool for screening applicants and selecting the most qualified finalists, the Anonymous Screening Process will substantially ensure that all candidates are evaluated objectively and fairly on the basis of specific job-related criteria explicitly described in the position description. The research brought this matter into qualitative focus in the following ways:

1. steps in the "traditional" employment process were affirmed;
2. comparative weaknesses of the traditional employment process in ensuring objectivity, fairness, and equal opportunity were documented;
3. essential elements of an objective-based anonymous applicant screening process were identified and defined for the purpose of designing an alternative process; and
4. an objective-based anonymous applicant screening process was developed incorporating the essential elements and the vital procedural attributes for

substantially ensuring objectivity, fairness, and equal opportunity.

Determining the elements essential to an objective-based anonymous applicant screening process provided baseline criteria for designing an alternative process that has not been previously articulated. Recommendations for future implementation of the Anonymous Screening Process and follow-up assessment will provide critical insight into the effectiveness and perceived fairness of an anonymous applicant screening approach. The responses and suggestions that emerge from this future research may be used in the design modification of the process to accommodate other employment categories and educational organizations.

The severity of the problem of bias in the applicant screening process is evidenced by the extent to which American businesses, colleges, universities, and other enterprises are using limited variations of an anonymous applicant screening process (Madison Area Technical College, 1991; City of Portland, 1991; Metropolitan Service District, 1991). The linkages and procedural variances that exist among the current employment screening practices needed to be studied because they extend the application of the literature, theories, and models used in current practice into the new methodology. Additionally, they provided baseline standards for assessing the new methodology in an educational environment that has not been previously

reported. Having developed linkages between current employment practices and the design of an anonymous applicant screening process legitimizes their selective incorporation into the anonymous applicant model. Moreover, linkages and procedural variances underscored the uncertainty in current employment screening processes and suggested an opportunity for a new paradigm in a field that is experiencing extensive interest and controversy.

Some of the terms and concepts used throughout this study are context-dependent. Defined below are those terms which are most essential and occur most frequently. Other terms or phrases are considered to be self-explanatory.

Definitions

- o **Adverse (Disparate) Impact:** a substantially different rate of selection in hiring which imputes a disadvantage to members of a race, sex, or ethnic group (Day, Erwin & Koral, 1982).
- o **Affirmative Action:** the specific, results-oriented, and proactive good faith effort to recruit qualified minority and women candidates to obtain a demographically representative balance and a means of eliminating the effects of past and present discrimination (intended or unintended) indicated by analysis of present employment patterns, practices or policies; Affirmative

Action is mandated by Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 (Kaplin, 1989).

- o **Anonymous Applicant Screening:** a "blind" applicant evaluation and selection process of identifying those persons who, based on essential job-related criteria, are considered to be the most qualified among the total pool of applicants.
- o **Disparate Treatment:** a difference in treatment of an individual from other individuals because of his/her race, sex, national origin, or religion that results in a denial of an employment opportunity or a detrimental employment condition (Kaplin, 1989).
- o **Diverse Representation:** the gender and racial mix of individuals who comprise the pool of applicants for an employment opportunity.
- o **Equal Employment Opportunity:** a condition of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that requires employers to provide all individuals the same employment opportunities regardless of sex, race, color, religion, or national origin based on job-related standards (Stanford University, 1987).
- o **Equally Qualified:** the comparative equality or equal ranking of the finalists' job-related education, skills, and work experience.

- o **Essential Functions:** the critical job-related physical, mental and communication skills that accurately reflect job functions and are required for performance of the job (Americans with Disabilities Act, 1990).
- o **Job-Related Criteria:** the specific criteria that measures directly whether an individual is qualified for a given job, and are used to determine that person's ability to perform the duties and responsibilities of the job (Standford University, 1987).
- o **Most Qualified:** those applicants who, based on comparative job-related education, skills, and work experience, demonstrate the greatest or highest degree of achievement and ability.
- o **Non-Tenured Administrative Academic Appointments:** non-teaching, non-research, and usually non-ranked fixed-term faculty positions in higher education administration that are characteristic of directors and assistant directors, vice presidents and assistant or associate vice presidents, and presidents.
- o **Objective-Based Criteria:** those job-related education and work experiences that are specifically required or preferred and explicitly stated in the position announcement.

- o **Predetermined Bias:** the intent of any individual or group of individuals, who is directly involved or influential in the final selection, to hire a type or category of person prior to selecting the finalist pool of most qualified applicants.
- o **Preferred Criteria:** those objective job-related education or work experiences that are desirable but are not required in order to successfully perform the job.
- o **Protected Classes:** groups of individuals who have historically suffered discrimination and are protected by federal law (Stanford University, 1987).
- o **Screening Process:** that part of the employment process that encompasses applicant evaluation and selection through the establishment of the most qualified finalist pool.
- o **Undue Influence:** any action taken or statement made by executive management or other influential person that threatens, intimidates or directs any member of the selection committee to bias his/her evaluations of the applicants.

CHAPTER II

Review of Current Literature

Scope of the Study

A review of the literature was conducted to determine the severity of the problem of bias and discrimination in the traditional employment process and the extent to which American businesses, colleges, universities, and other enterprises are using an anonymous applicant screening process to address these problems.

The evaluation of applicants and selection of most qualified finalists were the primary focus of the literature review. Numerous issues were explored including:

1. How and by whom are applicants evaluated?
2. What documentation must be submitted by potential candidates?
3. What objective-based criteria are used to evaluate applicants for inclusion in the finalist pool?
4. What other criteria are used to screen applicants for inclusion in the finalist pool?

This review integrated three literature sources. First, existing laws, statutes, executive orders, uniform guidelines, and institutional policies that serve as the basic sources of authority were examined as they describe the legal framework within which an anonymous screening process must be implemented. Second, research articles found in the Educational Resources Information Center

(ERIC), dissertation, business, psychology, and social sciences data bases were cited in an effort to better understand some of the critical sociopolitical and psychosocial issues relevant to the proposed research, and incorporate these into the design of the process. Third, alternative applicant selection and evaluation processes designed to ensure fairness were critically examined to identify potential elements for inclusion, as well as procedural caveats, in the development of an anonymous applicant screening process.

Support for the Study

The need for empirical research into the development of an objective-based, anonymous applicant screening process has been alluded to by numerous investigators who have chronicled evaluation and selection bias in traditional employment screening processes (Turner, Fix, & Struyk, 1991; Weatherspoon, 1991; Leedom, 1989; Grant, 1988; Slattery, 1988; Gerdes & Husted, 1987; Ford, 1985; Waggaman, 1983; Couch, 1981; Arvey, 1979).

A review of the literature revealed that current applicant screening processes for non-tenured administrative employment are highly susceptible to personal bias, the interjection of non-objective criteria (e.g., race, color, gender, age, handicap), and undue influence from internal and external sources. The judgement process "...is always already corrupted by ideological and cultural factors..." (Montoya, 1991, p. 2). Consequently, many highly qualified applicants are unlawfully excluded and never reach the pool of most qualified finalists.

A recent report by the Urban Institute on discriminatory employment practices concludes that minority job seekers experience more difficulty in **submitting** an application for a job than their white colleagues. Overall, the study found that white applicants were treated more favorably in ten percent (10%) of the audits, whereas blacks

were treated more favorably in only eight percent (8%) of the audits (Turner, et al., 1991).

In addition, a statistical analysis conducted by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the 1985 mean annual earnings of "equally qualified" bachelors degree recipients segregated by race and sex tends to support the notion of denied and diminished opportunities among protected classes: white males earned approximately thirty-four percent (34%) more than white females, twenty-three percent (23%) more than black females and males, and twenty percent (20%) more than hispanic males and females (Adelman, 1991). These significant differences suggest that race and sex bias in the traditional applicant review and evaluation processes effectively screen out the most qualified protected class applicants from higher level and higher paying job opportunities.

Discrimination in employment is not necessarily intentional--we all possess inherent biases based on a complex set of stereotypes that influence our decisions (Fernandez, 1991). Although comprehensive federal and state civil rights legislation and affirmative action mandates have been passed to mitigate intentional discrimination in employment (Kaplin, 1989; Arvey & Faley, 1988; Day, et al., 1982), and public institutions of higher education have implemented specific policies skillfully articulated to address the same (Oregon State University, 1989),

discrimination in the employment *process* continues to occur (Turner, et al., 1991; Weatherspoon, 1991; Wilson, 1989).

The number of outstanding employment-related lawsuits alleging sex or race discrimination in higher education is indicative of the extent of the problem. This, in spite of the fact that the majority of the outcomes are in favor of the defendant-institutions over the plaintiff-employees by a four-to-one ratio (Schoenfeld & Zirkel, 1989). However, public sector pay equity initiatives have yielded over \$450 million to thousands of women and people of color working in public higher education and other publicly funded institutions (Ford Foundation, 1989).

Recent employment studies focusing on gender- and race-related evaluation bias supported the notion that between resumes of similarly qualified applicants, where one resume is known to represent a white male and the other a woman or minority, the woman or minority candidate will be evaluated lower than the white male (Turner, et al., 1991; Gordon & Owens, 1988; Mitchell & Henning, 1987; Hitt, 1982; Northcraft, 1982). Moreover, gender bias in evaluations are highly subject to effects of ambiguity, job sex-type, rater gender, and other non-job-relevant information (Turner, et al., 1991; Johnson, 1989; Gerdes & Husted, 1987; Couch, 1981). The majority of American society still interpret female and male roles fairly rigidly and restrictively (Fernandez, 1991).

An earlier report released by the Urban Institute of discrimination against Hispanic job-seekers concluded that Hispanics appear even more likely than blacks to be denied equal opportunity through the hiring process. The study found that the equally qualified "majority applicant advanced farther through the hiring process in thirty-one percent (31%) of the Hispanic-Anglo audits" (Turner, et al., 1991, p. 32).

Studies regarding age discrimination in personnel selection concluded that under age-neutral conditions, managers preferred the older, more experienced candidate for the high-status job, but made less favorable decisions toward the older applicant when age was known (DeMille, 1989; Singer & Sewell, 1989; Cleveland, 1985).

The pervasiveness of employment discrimination against handicapped persons was deemed profoundly evident by Congress following congressional hearings on the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). "Congress received and considered various reports which studied the nature and extent of discrimination against people with disabilities", writes Floyd D. Weatherspoon in the Summer, 1991 issue of the Vermont Law Review (p. 265). Among the basic conclusions of Congress were that: 1) historically and currently, discrimination against handicapped persons is pervasive in our society; and 2) current federal and state laws are inadequate to address this discrimination.

Race, gender, age, and handicap discrimination in employment evaluation and selection are well documented; and anonymous applicant studies concluded there are no significant differences in the overall ratings for similarly qualified candidates (Turner, et al., 1991; Northcraft, 1982; Couch, 1981). Despite these data, the development and use of a truly objective standardized anonymous applicant screening process for selecting the most qualified finalists in educational, public or private institutions is nonexistent in higher education, although several public entities were found that have incorporated to a limited extent certain elements of an anonymous applicant screening process (City of Portland, 1991; Madison Area Technical College, 1991; Metropolitan Service District, 1991). In these processes, applicant anonymity was maintained through the initial screening, but was compromised later in the selection process. Applicant evaluations and selections were subject to manipulation and external intervention *prior* to identifying the most qualified finalists, thus compromising the integrity of their processes.

The procedural similarities of these partially anonymous employment processes to the traditional process described in the literature are the requirements of completing an official application form, submitting a letter of application and professional resume, completing an exam or questionnaire, and voluntarily completing an affirmative

action form. Each employed the use of a selection committee and used a Likert-type evaluation system.

The procedural difference from the traditional employment process was the anonymity (applicant's social security number) required in submitting exams or questionnaires. These anonymously submitted instruments were used to facilitate evaluative objectivity and to minimize bias. Although these exams and questionnaires were the primary means of evaluation, letters of application and personal resumes that were not anonymous were used also. The use of open letters of application and personal resumes potentially subjects applicants to evaluator biases, search committee members to undue influence from various internal and external constituencies, and permits intervention from human resources and affirmative action officers who could add to or substitute candidates in the objectively selected finalist pool with persons that otherwise would have been eliminated from further consideration.

Experts continue to disagree on the appropriateness and timing of remedial intervention during evaluation or selection, the extent to which affirmative action should permeate the employment process, and the psychological impact it has on applicants, the institution and society. Indeed, United States Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas in his confirmation hearing testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee argued that special consideration and

preferential treatment of protected classes are not appropriate or legal mechanisms for redressing employment discrimination, and that perhaps non-discriminatory objective-based alternatives leveraged with stiff pecuniary penalties may be more effective and equitable.

The Uniform Guidelines on Employment Selection Procedures provides for implementation of alternative processes that meet the legitimate needs of academe. These processes were less likely to have adverse impact than traditional procedures (Day, et al., 1982) and minimized biased and stressful hiring practices that can elicit applicant ambivalence (Pettigrew & Martin, 1987). Yet, to date, there has been little research on developing a new applicant screening paradigm for higher education irrespective of the legal mandates for equal opportunity and objectivity in the evaluation and selection processes.

The emerging literature in human resources management on applicant screening techniques (Arciniega, 1990; Cooper & Garmon, 1990; Jensen, 1990; Albert, 1989; Bromert, 1989; Tanner & Young, 1983) provided a theoretical framework for viewing the need for an objective alternative employment process and reflects the complexity of the issue of fairness.

Steps in the Traditional Employment Process

There were seven primary steps identified in the literature that comprise the traditional employment process:

1. Position Development
2. Recruitment
3. Application
4. Evaluation
5. Selection
6. Interview
7. Hire

Flow of the Traditional Employment Process

The sequential flow of the traditional and optional steps in the employment process are presented in Figure 1 on page 31 (adapted from Arvey & Faley, 1988, p. 8), followed by a discussion of those steps relevant to this study, each with supporting citations.

FIGURE 1. Traditional and Optional Steps in the Employment Process



Position Development

The Position Development phase of the employment process is critical for defining and clearly articulating the essential, position-specific objective criteria used in the employment screening process. These include the duties, responsibilities, skills, experience, education, and work environment relevant to the position (Arvey & Faley, 1988). Position development is often performed by the search committee in conjunction with the hiring department, and in consultation with the human resources and affirmative action offices. It requires considerable thought and position analysis to concisely articulate job-related criteria that are realistic, comprehensive, objective, and measurable (Arciniega, 1990; Bromert, 1984; Day, et al., 1982). It also requires considerable training to educate the search committee members about equal employment opportunity mandates, affirmative action goals, and issues of diversity.

The Search Committee is a relatively new phenomenon that has resulted from state and federal legislation, a more participatory approach to college administration, and an enlarged pool of qualified candidates (Bromert, 1984). Researchers emphasize that of the common characteristics that contribute to successful searches, careful attention to the composition of the search committee is critical (Person & Newman, 1988). Committee membership should be diverse and representative of the institution at large (Cooper & Garmon,

1990; Appleberry, 1987; Bromert, 1984; Riesman, 1983).

Moreover, a search committee that reflects a diverse profile of the institution, rather than a narrow, myopic focus can significantly mitigate the prevalence of undue influence (Groll, 1990).

Effective position development for a non-tenured administrative appointment requires three job analysis procedures that focus on different types of job-related information (Arvey & Faley, 1988; Weitman, 1983): *task-oriented* analysis emphasizes responsibilities and duties; *professional-oriented* analysis concerns mental processes, decision making and interpersonal communications; and *ability-oriented* analysis examines skills, experience and education necessary to perform the job effectively and efficiently.

The results of these analyses should yield a detailed list of qualifications encompassing the essential, preferred, and peripheral criteria upon which applicants will be evaluated (Cooper & Garmon, 1990). The *essential* criteria are the minimum qualifications an individual must possess to be considered qualified for the job; *preferred* criteria are those experiences, education, and skills that exemplify an individual's ability to perform the job responsibilities in a competent and timely manner; and the *peripheral* criteria reflect the highly desirable personal

characteristics such as human relations skills, creativity, and motivation that are predictor variables of job success.

The position development phase is complete when the search committee has been fully educated regarding the evaluation criteria, its affirmative action responsibilities, and the institution's ultimate employment goal of hiring the best qualified person (Arciniega, 1990; Cooper & Garmon, 1990; Person & Newman, 1988; Bromert, 1984).

Recruitment

The Recruitment phase is a vital step in the employment process that involves optimizing the number and diversity of qualified applicants (American Council on Education, 1986). The goal of recruitment is to ensure a representative pool of candidates and, simultaneously, a fair selection process (Jensen, 1990), with achievement the main criteria (Silber, 1989).

A successful outcome of the recruitment will generally reflect the level of effort and scope of the search. Under affirmative action, where under-utilization of protected classes has been identified, special recruitment efforts are targeted toward those areas and sources (Stanford University, 1987). Success may be defined in terms of an "assertive search" (Person & Newman, 1988), one that meets affirmative action requirements in obtaining a diverse applicant pool representing groups who have traditionally

been under-represented in administrative positions (Arciniega, 1990; Reed, 1989).

Institutions seeking to fill administrative vacancies should conduct the broadest practicable search that is reasonable given the organizational significance of the position. "This should include...women and minorities locally and nationwide ..." (Oregon State University, 1983, p. 3). Key variables to consider in determining the scope of the search are geographics and demographics. At a minimum, an administrative position should be advertised in a national journal, such as The Chronicle of Higher Education, and other widely known, circulated and accepted published employment sources (Cooper & Garmon, 1990). Other sources for the search may include local and regional newspapers, professional newsletters, journals and magazines, computer networks, bulletin boards, and word of mouth. Public institutions will also be subject to state statutes or administrative regulations that establish procedures applicable to higher education personnel actions (Kaplín, 1989; Day et.al., 1982).

Application

There are four critical points in the application, evaluation and selection phases at which the potential for bias occurs in the traditional process. The design of an anonymous screening process becomes significant in the Application phase, and procedurally is clearly distinguished

from the traditional process. Application requirements for a traditional administrative search include a letter of application, pre-printed application form, professional resume or vita, list or letters of reference, and affirmative action data form (Arvey & Faley, 1988). Other required application materials may include an extensive written examination or questionnaire, college transcripts, and recent "work" samples. Each document typically identifies the applicant by name and address, but may also contain other non job-related demographic data such as date of birth, race, sex, handicap, etc.

In the traditional process, all application materials, usually exclusive of the affirmative action data form, are sent directly to the Chair of the search committee. Upon receipt, the materials are reviewed for completeness and filed alphabetically under lock-and-key until the filing deadline is reached. This is the **first** point at which the potential for bias occurs. It is the point at which the applicant's ethnic, racial, gender, age, or handicap identity may be revealed or presumed, opening the door for the interjection of intentional or unintentional bias that compromises the integrity of the entire employment process (Weatherspoon, 1991; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Hitt, 1982; Arvey, 1979).

The traditional employment process is vulnerable to predetermined biases to hire or not hire a particular person

or type of person (Arvey & Faley, 1988). Committee members' objective consideration may also be biased by the hiring authority to give special consideration to a certain applicant or those of a particular race or sex. Applicants who do not meet whatever special criteria that have been established may be "flagged" and summarily eliminated, often leading to questions of ethical and legal propriety (Cahn, 1989).

Evaluation

The evaluation process consists of a series of sequential events designed to identify the top candidates for inclusion in the most qualified finalist pool. Applications are divided approximately equally among the search committee members for initial screening based on the essential job-related criteria and preferred position requirements that may or may not be job-related. This is the **second** point where the potential for bias occurs.

Numerous studies focusing on race, sex and age, job sex-type, and rater gender biases concluded that these biases will tend to be minimized when more objective, job-related information is available (Gordon & Owens, 1988; Gerdes & Husted, 1987; Martinko & Gardner, 1983; Etaugh & Riley, 1980). Conversely, these conclusions and other anonymously-based studies (Singer & Sewell, 1989; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Hitt, 1982) suggested that where applicants' race, sex, and age are not identified, bias may be

effectively eliminated and objective job-related qualifications become the exclusive evaluative criteria.

Applicants who do not meet the minimum requirements are eliminated from further consideration, and so notified by mail. The remaining candidates are numerically evaluated using a Likert-type grading scale. Numerical values for each applicant are totaled and the best qualified ten-twelve chosen as semi-finalists based on the top-priority criteria (Albert, 1989). This is the **third** point at which the potential for bias occurs.

Rater bias, both negative and positive concerning applicants' race, gender, age, handicap, and the sex role of the position, again surfaced in numerical evaluations, particularly where the rater may be subconsciously influenced by stereotypes and misconceptions that frequently include assumptions of incompetence for critical job-related skills (Weatherspoon, 1991; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Speth et al., 1986; Northcraft, 1983) or by myths about affirmative action including assumptions that minority women are prime candidates for hire because they represent two protected groups (Wilson, 1987).

Selection

Selection of the most qualified finalists is a complex and highly critical step in the employment process. It is the point at which the surviving candidates are further evaluated during a "round-table" assembly of the full search

committee. Here, the relative strengths and weaknesses of each are thoroughly discussed and documented in an exercise to achieve consensus as to the best qualified candidates and narrow the pool to three to five "equally" qualified finalists (Cooper & Garmon, 1990; Albert, 1989; Dale, 1987). This is the **fourth** point where the potential for bias occurs.

In contrast to the envisioned anonymous applicant process, the traditional process is highly subjective and vulnerable to undue influence from internal and external constituencies and rater bias as to race, sex, age, or handicap (Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Martinko & Gardner, 1983; Etaugh & Riley, 1980). The traditional process continues to fuel assumptions of tokenism and preferential treatment, claims of discrimination and reverse discrimination, and the perpetuation of a system perceived by protected classes and white males alike to be inequitable: one based on numbers, not merit (Jaschik, 1989; United States Reports, 1989; Arvey & Faley, 1988; Northcraft, 1982).

Northcraft (1982) concluded that the biasing effects of tokenism can be alleviated if information about competency and personal similarity of the protected class and non-protected class applicants is conspicuously presented. Alternatively, if non job-related personal

characteristics are unknown to the search committee, these biasing effects will be eliminated.

Undue influence also may have a profound impact on the outcome of the selection process, significantly biasing the objective consideration of all applicants. The hiring or supervisory authority, under pressure from influential constituents to meet specific goals and timetables, or conversely, possessing predetermined biases and prejudices may threaten, cajole and intimidate search committee members into including or excluding certain persons or types of applicants (Groll, 1990).

Testing, Interviewing, and Hiring

An in-depth analysis of the testing, interviewing and hiring phases of the traditional employment process was beyond the scope of this study. However, it was important to have obtained a clear understanding of these phases as they related to the purpose of the study: to design an objective-based anonymous screening process for selecting the most qualified finalists for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education.

Testing (Optional)

Essay or multiple-choice testing, which may or may not be utilized in an administrative search depending upon the level of the position, institutional tradition and a variety of other factors, have inherent biases and discriminatory

shortcomings that are too numerous and complex to address here. Please refer to Arvey and Faley (1988), Fairness in Selecting Employees, for a detailed discussion and analysis of employment testing.

Interviewing

In-person interviews take place immediately following selection of the most qualified finalists. Interviews are also subject to the range of biases previously discussed. However, these occur after the candidates' identities *must* be revealed, and consequently, fall outside of the anonymous applicant process. Again, Arvey and Faley (1988), Fairness in Selecting Employees, provide an excellent comprehensive discussion and analysis of discrimination and bias in employment interviews.

Hiring

The ultimate decision of the appointing authority is to hire or reject a selected finalist. In the quest to hire the best person for the job and avoid the costs of making a poor decision (Coady, 1990), careful consideration must be given to a plethora of different ponderables including quality of mind and character (Rosenblatt, 1991), diversity of background and experience (Strossen, 1991), special ethnic strengths and resources (Arciniega, 1990), significant achievements (Silber, 1989), articulation and fluency of speech (McDowell & Mrozla, 1987), and consistency with the institution's needs and values (Bromert, 1984).

Moreover, it is at this point reasonable and appropriate to consider protected class status as one additional criterion to obtain a demographically representative balance, and as a means of eliminating the effects of past or present discrimination that are evidenced by analysis of present employment patterns, practices, or policies. Affirmative action provides that once a group of objectively evaluated "equally qualified" finalists are selected, a bona fide determination of manifest imbalance has been made, and there exists a minority or woman candidate among the finalists, protected status may be considered when filling a traditionally segregated position (Schmidt, 1991; Groll, 1990; Tatel & Mincberg, 1989).

The Essential Elements of the Applicant Screening Process

A review of the literature suggested that there are only five elements which are absolutely necessary or legally required to be included in **any** employment process. A brief discussion of these elements and why each is essential in the applicant screening process are included in this section.

The responsibility for ensuring that all of the essential elements are provided and received by the appropriate parties rests jointly with the institution and the individual applicants. However, it is incumbent upon the institution to clearly and concisely articulate these mutual responsibilities to each applicant.

Institution

Position Description: The position description is a published document stating the required, preferred, and desirable job-related qualifications an interested applicant should possess to effectively and efficiently fulfill the responsibilities of the job (Arvey & Faley, 1988). The position description contains the evaluative criteria upon which candidates are judged as ascertained in the position analysis (Arciniega, 1990; Bromert, 1984; Day, et al., 1982). The position description is essential to the employment process because it is the primary source for applicant evaluation, and also provides a framework for the position advertisement.

Public Notice or Advertisement: Communication of an employment opportunity must contain basic institutional information (name and location of the institution, college and department, position title), essential job-related criteria (education, experience, skills), and fundamental application requirements (letter of application, resume, references, closing date, etc.). The geographic scope, media sources, and timing of the advertisement are vital for facilitating affirmative action objectives of obtaining a demographically diverse and representative balance of applicants (Arciniega, 1990; American Council on Education, 1986; Reed, 1986). This information is essential to the employment process because it is a de jure requirement of federal and state equal employment opportunity laws, institutional policies and procedures, affirmative action mandates, and uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures (Kaplin, 1989; Oregon State University, 1989; Arvey & Faley, 1988; Day, et al., 1982).

Affirmative Action Data Form: The affirmative action form provides detailed personal data including name, date of birth, gender, race, handicap and/or veteran status and other potentially biasing non job-related information (Arvey, 1979). Applicants are advised that submission of the completed form is optional, but strongly encouraged. These data are supposed to remain unknown to the search committee and submitted separately from the other

application materials. Applicants are assured that these data will not be used to discriminate against them, but may be used to select similarly qualified candidates who represent a protected class (Wilson, 1987; Reed, 1986). This information is essential to the employment process because institutions that fall within the "government action doctrine" are required by federal discrimination laws to request, compile, and annually report statistical employment data (Kaplin, 1989; Arvey & Faley, 1988; Day, et al., 1982). Most state equal employment opportunity, civil rights, and veterans administration laws also compel affirmative action data reporting.

Applicant

Letter of Application: The letter of application serves as the candidates' introduction of themselves to the search committee. Thus far, its potential as the primary resource for applicant evaluation has been significantly under-utilized in the traditional employment process.

Nonetheless, the letter of application is essential to the employment process because it provides the search committee with insight into the written communication skills of the applicant including articulation, conceptualization, and comprehensiveness. Moreover, it provides fundamental information necessary for contacting the applicant in a timely manner (e.g., name, address, telephone number) that may not be obtained from other sources.

Professional Resume or Vita: Professional resumes and vitae are chronologically narrated applicant histories containing vital detailed job-related information such as experience, education, major accomplishments, professional development, and public service. This information is essential to the employment process because it is the current primary source of applicant evaluation used in the traditional screening process (Cooper & Garmon, 1990; Arvey & Faley, 1988; McDowell & Mrozla, 1987).

Multiple-page non-standardized application forms also are often required in the employment process. These forms, which tend to provide information that is basically the same as that contained in the resume, are both redundant and unnecessary. Moreover, non-standardized application forms are the epitome of an administrative bureaucracy: they differ considerably in format and style among institutions and, thus, are non-transferrable; they rarely provide adequate space for substantive information transfer; they promote suppression of meaningful evaluative data and creative expression; and consequently, they inhibit comprehensive applicant evaluation and, in some cases, discourage application.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

The Design of the Study

This study was an empirical investigation of the applicant screening processes inclusive of recruitment, application, evaluation, and selection as they impact the most qualified finalist pool in public higher education administrative employment searches. The intent was to design a viable employment process that substantially meets equal opportunity mandates, the dual aim of the Federal government's affirmative action efforts to eliminate the discriminatory effects of the past and to bar future discrimination, and the goal of the U.S. Congress of improving the economic status of disabled individuals by removing discriminatory barriers to full employment.

An anonymous screening process is part of a comprehensive employment process wherein an applicant's name, race, religion, color, sex, age, handicap, and institutional identify are unknown to all persons involved in the process. An anonymous applicant screening process will minimize evaluator bias, effectively eliminate the interjection of non-objective criteria from external sources in selecting the most qualified finalists, and provide a defensible basis for using protected class status in the final selection as an additional criterion in situations of underrepresentation.

This study is intended to provide public institutions of higher education with an alternative applicant screening process that emphasizes essential job-related qualifications, minimizes evaluator bias, and substantially ensures equal opportunity and objective consideration of all candidates. Furthermore, this study aims to provide an objective-based screening process that may be generalized to other employment categories and educational organizations.

The procedures that were followed in conducting the investigation are presented in this chapter under five major divisions:

1. Affirmation of the "traditional" employment process;
2. Identification of the essential elements of an employment process;
3. Conceptualization of the preliminary design for an anonymous screening process outlining how the traditional employment process and essential elements can be modified to ensure fairness, objectivity, and equal employment opportunity;
4. Compilation and analysis of the data from the Delphi respondents; and
5. Design modification, preparation, and distribution of the anonymous screening process with supporting exhibits.

FIGURE 2. Procedural Steps of the Study

Phase I:	Affirmed, using the Delphi Method, the procedural steps and requirements of the "traditional" employment process.
a.	Reviewed the Literature
b.	Described the "Traditional" Employment Process
c.	Identified the Principal Steps and Requirements
d.	Submitted to the Delphi Panel to:
1.	Assess Frequency of Occurrence of the Principal Steps and Requirements; and
2.	Affirm the Traditional Employment Process

FIGURE 2. Continued

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Phase II: | Identified, using the Delphi Method, the essential elements of an employment process. |
| a. | Reviewed the Literature |
| b. | Described the Applicant Information Items Commonly Requested in the "Traditional" Employment Process |
| c. | Identified the Essential Elements of the Traditional Employment Process |
| d. | Submitted to the Delphi Panel to Identify the Essential Elements of An Employment Process |

FIGURE 2. Continued

- Phase III: Conceptualized the preliminary design for an Anonymous Screening Process; described, using the Delphi Method, how the traditional employment process and essential elements can be modified to accommodate an anonymous screening process.
- a. Prepared a Detailed Outline of the Preliminary Design for an Anonymous Screening Process Articulating the Suggested Process Modifications and Essential Elements
 - b. Submitted the Preliminary Anonymous Screening Process Design to the Delphi Panel for Review, Critical Comment, and Suggestions:
 - 1. Is the process fair and objective?
 - 2. Does it minimize bias and meet legal requirements?
 - 3. What changes would you recommend?

FIGURE 2. Continued

- Phase IV: Compiled and analyzed the data from the Delphi respondents to affirm the traditional employment process, identified the essential elements of an employment process, and achieved consensus regarding the design of an Anonymous Screening Process.
- a. Received Evaluations, Critiques, and Suggestions from Delphi in Postage-Paid Return Addressed Envelopes
 - b. Summarized Data for Each Component in Phases I-III of the Preliminary Anonymous Screening Process Using Responses to the Delphi Panel Questionnaire:
 - 1. Applicant Information Matrix; and
 - 2. Open Response Format Questions
 - c. Verified Consensus Among Delphi Regarding their Recommended Changes to the Anonymous Screening Process

FIGURE 2. Continued

- Phase V: Modified the design of the Anonymous Screening Process (ASP) based on the changes, criticisms, and suggestions of the Delphi consensus.
- a. Prepared an In-depth Narrative Description of the Revised ASP Incorporating the Consensus Modifications from the Delphi Process
 - b. Prepared the Supporting Exhibits for the ASP:
 - 1. Position Description;
 - 2. Notice of Position Vacancy;
 - 3. Application Instructions and Forms;
 - 4. Letter of Application;
 - 5. Professional Resume; and
 - 6. Evaluation Forms.
 - c. Distributed the ASP with Supporting Exhibits to the Delphi Participants for Final Review and Possible Implementation
 - d. Received Signed Memorandums of Acceptance of the ASP
 - e. Tabulated Responses to Verify Consensus Among the Delphi to Support the Process as Presented
 - f. Achieved Consensus for the ASP:
 - 1. At Least Eighty Percent (80%) of the Delphi Concurred Conceptually with; or
 - 2. Agreed to Support the Process as Presented Pending Future Implementation and Follow-Up Assessment

The "Traditional" Employment Process and Identification of the Essential Elements

In **Phases One and Two**, a review of the literature was conducted (see Chapter II) to describe the "traditional" employment process and to identify the essential elements of an employment process, respectively. With this information, a survey questionnaire (see Appendix A: Delphi Panel Information Packet, Delphi Panel Questionnaire) was designed to verify by consensus essential elements of the employment process identified in the literature. Using the Delphi Method, the survey was administered to a representative group of ten human resources and affirmative action experts solicited from approximately forty-two, four-year, public Western colleges and universities with student head counts greater than 5,000 (see Appendix B: Four-Year Public Western Colleges and Universities with Student Head Count Greater Than 5,000).

The Delphi Method

The Delphi process is a common qualitative research technique used to reach consensus among an independent panel of recognized experts in a particular field (e.g., education law, human resources, and affirmative action). Participants were asked to respond to a series of questions stating their opinions and suggestions regarding specific employment processes. Individual panelists' responses were held strictly confidential and anonymous.

The intent was that the panel's responses would converge on consensus, inferring reasonably sound conclusions about the employment process. However, consensus was not essential as the Delphi process allowed for justified differences of opinion rather than attempting to produce unanimity (Bowerman & O'Connell, 1979).

Selecting the Delphi Panelists

A concerted effort was made to obtain a diverse group of up to twelve experts to serve on the Delphi panel: six human resources professionals and six affirmative action professionals representing at least six different institutions in the Western United States. Human resources and affirmative action experts from approximately forty-two, four-year public colleges and universities in Alaska, California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington with student enrollment greater than 5,000 head count were identified through regional affiliates of the Association of Institutional Research (AIR), of which the researcher is a long-term member, and solicited by telephone as potential Delphi panelists.

In addition, several recognized education experts in law, human resources, and affirmative action were contacted for possible participation as ex-officio advisors. A follow-up letter was sent to each ex-officio advisor confirming his/her agreement to participate in a comprehensive review of the proposal and describing the

specific expectations of that participation (see Appendix A).

If the response was greater than twelve experts, control and selection of the Delphi panelists were to proceed as follows:

1. All potential Delphi panelists who responded "yes" to participating would have been segregated by discipline (e.g., Human Resources, Affirmative Action).
2. Individuals would have been selected randomly to equal six representatives each from Human Resources and Affirmative Action, but not to exceed a total of twelve Delphi.
3. Alternate selections would have been made using a one-two-two-one-one rotation until six persons from each discipline are chosen.
4. If two persons representing the same institution were selected, the second one chosen would have been replaced by another randomly selected person from that discipline if additional persons were available.
5. If less than six persons were available in one or both disciplines, all persons from the under-represented discipline would have been selected with the balance of the Delphi randomly selected from the other discipline up to a total of twelve.

Experts were defined as those individuals who, at minimum, held the position of Assistant Director or a similar position of comparable knowledge, experience, and authority. Individuals who expressed an interest were sent an information packet containing a description of the study, their expected level of participation and institutional commitment, and instructions and documentation required for the first round of the Delphi consensus building process. Also enclosed for their signature, was a Memorandum of Acceptance to Participate (Appendix A). A follow-up telephone call was made if a response was not received within two weeks of the initial mailing.

Preliminary Design of the Anonymous Screening Process

Using the "traditional" process and essential elements as guides, a preliminary objective-based anonymous screening process was designed with the overall goal of ensuring evaluative fairness and objectivity through applicant anonymity. In **Phase Three**, the Delphi method was implemented to critically review and reach consensus on how this preliminary design of an anonymous screening process can be modified (e.g., data requested or presented differently) without jeopardizing the integrity of the process.

Each Delphi panelist was mailed a detailed outline of an anonymous applicant screening process envisioned by the researcher as part of the Delphi Panel Questionnaire and information packet (Appendix A). The panelists were asked to critically review and evaluate the researcher's suggested process modifications for fairness, objectivity, and legality in terms of their affirmed essential elements of an employment process. Each panelist was also asked to make judgements whether or not the suggested process minimized bias to the greatest degree possible given the inherent limitations for precluding all bias in any employment process. Panelists were asked to indicate in writing their full concurrence with the proposed anonymous applicant screening process or submit revisions that in their

professional opinion were critical and necessary to obtain the stated objectives of the anonymous screening process.

Compilation and Analysis of the Anonymous Screening Process

In **Phase Four**, data from the Delphi respondents were compiled and analyzed to affirm the traditional employment process, identify the essential elements of an employment process, and achieve consensus regarding the design of an Anonymous Screening Process.

Sources of Data

Evaluations, critiques, and suggestions from Delphi respondents were received in postage-paid return addressed envelopes initially submitted in the Delphi packet. Data were summarized and consensus among the Delphi verified regarding the traditional employment process, essential elements, and their suggested changes to the Anonymous Screening Process primarily using responses to the Delphi Panel Questionnaire.

Some data were anecdotal in nature and reflect the general perceptions of the respondents as assimilated from six (6) data sources:

1. Applicant Information Matrix;
2. Open Response Format Questions;
3. Formal Letters with Critiques, Comments, and Suggestions;
4. Informal Comments Written in the Margins of Returned Documents;
5. Notes from Telephone Conversations; and
6. Personal Interviews.

If necessary, subsequent iterations of the Delphi method were to continue until consensus was reached. Consensus for affirming the traditional employment process and identifying the essential elements was considered achieved when:

1. A simple majority of at least sixty percent (60%) of the Delphi affirmed an applicant information item (e.g., letter of application, resume, application form) as occurring "always" or "frequently"; and
2. At least eighty percent (80%) of the Delphi cited an applicant information item as being essential in the "primary" and "secondary" phases of an employment process.

Modification of the Design of the Anonymous Screening Process

In **Phase Five**, the preliminary design of the anonymous screening process was modified to incorporate the Delphi's suggestions and recommendations. Additionally, steps describing the traditional employment process and the essential elements were modified or eliminated consistent with feedback received.

An in-depth narrative description of the revised Anonymous Screening Process based on the changes, criticisms, and suggestions of the Delphi was prepared and is presented in Chapter IV: Results, immediately following. Supporting exhibits for the Anonymous Screening Process were also revised and prepared as per Delphi respondent feedback:

- o Position Description;
- o Notice of Position Vacancy;
- o Application Instructions and Forms;
- o Letter of Application;
- o Professional Resume; and
- o Evaluation Forms.

A second information packet containing the final design of the Anonymous Screening Process with supporting exhibits, a summary of the significant changes, and a memorandum of acceptance of the ASP was distributed to each Delphi participant for final review, acceptance in writing, and possible implementation. Signed memorandums of acceptance

of the Anonymous Screening Process were received in stamped, self-addressed envelopes and tabulated to verify that consensus among the Delphi to support the process as presented has been attained. Consensus for the ASP was considered achieved when at least eighty percent (80%) of the Delphi concurred conceptually with the final draft of the process as presented, or at a minimum, agreed to support the process as presented pending future implementation and follow-up assessment. The documents contained in the second Delphi packet are presented in Appendix C: Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process.

CHAPTER IV

Results

Composition of the Process Development Team

The final version of the Anonymous Screening Process (ASP) reflects considerable time, effort, and vital input from more than sixteen human resources, affirmative action, and education law professionals from major colleges and universities throughout the Western United States including Alaska, California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Additional review and insight were contributed from a highly respected and knowledgeable colleague from the Wisconsin State System of Higher Education.

The process development team comprised two independent groups of diverse professionals with different, albeit overlapping missions:

1. Delphi Panelists; and
2. Ex-Officio Advisors.

Delphi Panelists

The mission of the Delphi panel was to:

- o Affirm or revise the traditional employment process described in the literature;
- o Affirm or revise the essential elements of the employment process; and
- o Critically review the preliminary design of the Anonymous Screening Process and provide a written

assessment concurring with or suggesting modifications to the process.

The Delphi panel comprised ten affirmative action and human resource professionals who each signed and submitted a memorandum of acceptance to participate.

The comments and criticisms of three other professionals--the "unofficial" Delphi--who expressed an initial interest in the research but elected not to participate in the Delphi process were included in the modification of the ASP. Some of their poignant comments and questions raised valid concerns about certain elements in the process and offered valuable insight into the philosophical divergence of attitudes about equity, discrimination, affirmative action, and preferential treatment in an employment process. Although voluntary submission of their critiques partially assumed an identical role and mission to that of the Delphi panelists, these professionals were not included in the statistical base of Delphi respondents as shown in Table 1: Composition of the Delphi (p. 67), but are referenced in the footnote. Also, they were excluded from the base in determining consensus for the ASP among the "official" Delphi and were not asked to concur with or support the final process.

The apparent intransigent attitude of one of these professionals not to "officially" participate in but liberally criticize the development of an anonymous

screening process underscores the confusion regarding the intent and application of affirmative action strategies and, alternatively, the urgent need for the Anonymous Screening Process. The ASP was designed to eliminate from the employment process the very discriminatory biases, interventions, and non job-related variables (e.g., race, gender, handicap) that members of protected classes have fought so hard to overcome, but now advocate if it is affirmative discrimination. This, in the discriminatory language of the recent past, was preferential treatment.

The conflict and misunderstanding surrounding Affirmative Action mandates, race- and gender-conscious hiring decisions, and the distinction between preferential treatment and additional consideration in the employment process was strikingly evident in a few of the responses received from a Delphi panelist and an "unofficial" participant. These deeply moving, emotionally charged responses revealed the mixed signals and apparent contradictory demands placed on institutions and search committees to address non-discrimination concerns and diversity initiatives. These issues are discussed thoroughly in Chapter 5: Discussion, Biases and Prejudices of the Delphi, p. 110.

TABLE 1
Composition of the Delphi**

Key:

Geographics

AK = Alaska

CA = California

ID = Idaho

OR = Oregon

WA = Washington

Race/Color

B = Black/African
American

W = White

H = Hispanic

Profession

AA = Affirmative
Action

Law= Education Law

HR = Human Resources

Gender	Geographics					Totals
	AK	CA	ID	OR	WA	
Female			2	1	1	4
Male	1	3		1	1	6
Totals	1	3	2	2	2	10

Gender	Race/Color			Totals
	B	H	W	
Female	1		3	4
Male	3	1	2	6
Totals	4	1	5	10

Gender	Profession			Totals
	AA	HR	Other*	
Female	1	2	1	4
Male	3	2	1	6
Totals	4	4	2	10

*Other respondents are a Director of Human Resources and Affirmative Action and a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

**Three additional professionals--the "unofficial" Delphi--were also considered in the development of the ASP, but were excluded from the statistical and consensus bases: two persons (Female, Black, AA; Female, White, Other) submitted signed letters declining to participate but also submitted detailed critiques used in development of the process; and one person (Male, Hispanic, EEO) submitted a detailed critique used in development of the process but neither formally accepted nor declined the invitation to participate.

Ex-Officio Advisors

The mission of the ex-officio advisory group was to critically review and comment on the integrity of the entire research proposal and to specifically focus on the overall research design, legal integrity of the proposed anonymous screening process, and development and validation of the instruments.

The ex-officio advisors comprised four recognized affirmative action, human resources, and educational law experts from the states of Oregon and Wisconsin. The value of their contribution to the development of the Anonymous Screening Process was reflected in the diversity of their personal backgrounds, professional experience, and racial and gender characteristics. Ex-officio advisor demographics are presented in Table 2: Composition of the Ex-Officio Advisors (p. 69). Their combined professional and educational attributes included extensive private industry, state department of education, public school system, state system of higher education and comprehensive research university experience, and two doctoral and two law degrees.

The advisors, with few reservations, were very supportive of and enthusiastic about the ASP and its potential as a valuable, timely mechanism for addressing some serious societal concerns and legal mandates. Specific comments reflecting this support are presented under Supportive Results, p. 83, of this chapter.

TABLE 2
Composition of the Ex-Officio Advisors

Key:

Geographics AK = Alaska CA = California ID = Idaho OR = Oregon WA = Washington	Race/Color B = Black/African American W = White H = Hispanic	Profession AA = Affirmative Action Law= Education Law HR = Human Resources
--	---	---

Gender	Geographics		Totals
	Oregon	Other	
Female	1		1
Male	2	1	3
Totals	3	1	4

Gender	Race/Color			Totals
	B	H	W	
Female			1	1
Male	2		1	3
Totals	2		2	4

Gender	Profession			Totals
	AA	HR	Law	
Female			1	1
Male	1	1	1	3
Totals	1	1	2	4

The "Traditional" Employment Process

The tabulated results and distribution of responses to the Delphi Panel Questionnaire presented in Appendix D, Applicant Information Matrices, suggest that the "traditional" employment process always or frequently comprises six of the principal applicant information items previously detailed in Chapter II: Review of the Literature, Steps in the "Traditional" Employment Process.

The "traditional" employment process comprises the following elements based on professional affirmation by a simple majority--at least sixty percent (60%)--of the total Delphi respondent population, N=10:

- o Professional Resume or Vita (100%);
- o List of References (100%);
- o Letter of Application (90%);
- o Affirmative Action Data form (90%);
- o Letters of Reference (70%); and
- o Application Form (60%).

These results reflect the general perception of the Delphi about the principal elements of the traditional employment process.

The Essential Elements of an Employment Screening Process

Using the identical applicant information items identified in affirming the traditional employment process, the Delphi panelists were asked to verify the essential elements of an employment process by responding to two questions:

1. Is the item essential in an employment process?
2. If yes, at what point in the screening process: primary, secondary, or tertiary?

Each applicant information item had the potential of receiving one response, either yes or no. A response from each of the ten Delphi panelists yielded a response frequency value of 10 as a basis for percentile computation. As the level of specificity required is significantly greater for determining which elements are absolutely essential for inclusion in an employment process, particularly at the initial screening phase, so is the level of consensus required among the Delphi.

Consensus as to the essential elements in an employment screening process is based on affirmation by at least eighty percent (80%) of the Delphi responses that an element is essential in the primary and secondary phases of the employment process. This is consistent with the level of concurrence and acceptance required of the Delphi for affirming the Anonymous Screening Process as presented in the final draft.

In the collective professional opinion of at least 80% of the Delphi, the essential elements in the primary and secondary phases of an employment process comprise only two applicant information items of those attributed to the aforementioned traditional process:

- o Professional Resume or Vita (90%)
- o Letter of Application (90%)

The supporting numeric distributions and percentile computations are summarized in Appendix D. The two essential elements are described in detail in the literature review (see Chapter II: Review of the Literature, Essential Elements of the Applicant Screening Process).

Suggestions, Criticisms, and Comments

The process development team proffered several surprisingly consistent suggestions for modifying and enhancing the process, relatively few criticisms of the concept or the approach to the process, and a multitude of comments related to "fine-tuning" the process, personal support, and encouragement.

The major themes and emphases of the respondents' qualitative professional perspectives are summarized under the subsequent subsections of this chapter followed by formal presentation of the Anonymous Screening Process and supporting exhibits.

Suggestions for Modifying and Enhancing the Process

Suggestions for modifying and enhancing several areas in the preliminary proposal were tendered by a number of the Delphi respondents and ex-officio advisors which resulted in substantive changes to the ASP:

1. Most significantly, language has been incorporated into the body of the text regarding the Americans with Disability Act of 1990 and the applicability of the ASP in addressing the procedural requirements for ensuring that discriminatory barriers to full employment are removed from the screening process and that the "essential job-related functions" are accurately defined and clearly communicated.

2. Use of the term "blind" (screening) conveyed a confusing meaning and misleading purpose as to the nature of the process referring to a handicapping condition rather than applicant anonymity. This concern was dispelled by deleting all references to the word blind and using "anonymous" in its stead.
3. Use of the term "equally" (qualified) in the general text of the process, while recognized as an acceptable term in the human resources arena, was deemed by some a non sequitur if taken literally: no two applicants can possess identical experiential or personal qualifications. Controversy concerning this issue was resolved by deleting references to the word equally and substituting "most" in its place where appropriate.
4. Use of social security numbers as the exclusive means of applicant identification was acknowledged as an effective means of ensuring applicant anonymity but questioned on legal grounds, privacy infringement, and potential misuse. While the question of legality proved unfounded, the issues of privacy and potential misuse are valid issues. The final version of the ASP substantially ameliorates this problem by providing for the use

of an alternative applicant identification number for applicants with similar concerns.

5. A comprehensive position analysis was further developed in the ASP, in part to address concern that some very suitable, perhaps ideal, candidates may continue to fall through the cracks. The analysis incorporates "customers" served by the position (e.g., supervisors, peers, subordinates, faculty and staff, students) to identify essential job-related qualifications and personal attributes. Inasmuch as discrimination can begin at position development by the nature of the requirements, a lot depends upon how the criterion is drawn. In the ASP, the hiring college/department in collaboration with Human Resources and Affirmative Action performs the position analysis and development functions to ensure that the results reflect the essential position functions and job-related criterion through a participatory system of checks and balances. The Letter of Application provides all applicants the opportunity to articulate their unique skills, experiences, and personal attributes specifically to those of the position.
6. A substantive section on training for screening committee members was added as part of the

committee appointment process in an effort to mitigate prejudices and stereotypes by facilitating a better understanding of multicultural issues and the law. While it is virtually impossible to change an individual's emotional bias by changing the cognitive aspect, it might be helpful in facilitating empathy and understanding of others' perceptions. The training also serves a dual interest of the institution in providing a vital professional development opportunity.

7. Also incorporated as part of the search committee training, the chief administrative officer or principal line officer of the college/department presents to the search committee an overview of expectations for the position. This briefing provides additional insight and understanding of the essential job-related duties and responsibilities and how the position interrelates with the education community.
8. Eliminated from process and required application materials are all potentially biasing references such as dates of employment, names of degree-granting institutions, and names of institutions at which applicants are currently or have been employed, that may result in assumptions about an

applicant's race, gender, or age. In addition, applicants are instructed to present content-based references (e.g., strategic planning, sexual harassment) to conferences and workshops attended rather than potentially biasing specific sponsorships.

Additional changes and refinements are contained throughout the final draft that embody the diversity of the Delphi's and ex-officio advisor's altruistic suggestions for improvement and viability of the Anonymous Screening

Process:

- o Increased emphasis on accurately identifying and describing the essential job functions so that recruiting and hiring is focused on the essential criteria and not cultural identifiers.
- o Incorporated diversity training into the process.
- o Included minority representation on the screening committee.
- o Separated affirmative action data from the application at the earliest possible point.
- o Substituted use of a number for the applicant's name to prevent potential gender bias or family/friend name association.
- o Included an alternative to the use of social security numbers as the exclusive applicant identifier.

- o Avoided asking for dates of degrees.
- o Eliminated personal data, protected class data, and group membership or affiliation references.
- o Included the option of using additional applicant information items (e.g., references, essay questions, college transcripts) after selection of the most qualified finalists but before the on-site interviews.
- o Instructed applicants to send letters of application and resumes directly to search committee chair.
- o Separated all references to protected class data from whatever materials are delivered to the screening committee.
- o Included an overview by the chief executive officer or principal line officer regarding the expectations of the position.
- o Instructed applicants to state content (e.g., MBO, diversity training) rather than workshop titles or sponsors.
- o Used "demonstrated experience" rather than a fixed number of years in specifying essential job-related criterion.
- o Asked the nature of an applicant's disability and requested, "How might we accommodate you?"

- o Mentioned the possibility for multiple input from and interviews with other interested parties (e.g., faculty, students, public) in the final selection phase.
- o Withheld notification to all applicants until an offer has been made and accepted.

Constructive Criticisms

The Delphi respondents levied relative few criticisms against the Anonymous Screening Process. However, the most critical comments concerning the basic concept of an anonymous screening process were similarly expressed by two Affirmative Action professionals: one, a Delphi panelist; the other, an "unofficial" Delphi respondent. The detailed commentaries they submitted represent a point of view worthy of communicating, and which was seriously considered in development of the final process.

Every effort was made to address their concerns in the ASP without jeopardizing the basic concepts of anonymity and evaluative objectivity used in the process or the integrity of the research. The following paraphrased criticisms represent the collective opinions of the two aforementioned individuals. Their comments are discussed in detail in Chapter 5: Discussion, Biases and Prejudices of the Delphi, beginning on page 110:

- o The process does not allow personality of an applicant to be considered (which is a large factor for high level administrative types who have a public profile) who has all except one of the essential criteria, but is able to bring other qualifications to the position, such as diversity.
- o Rigidity of the criterion may result in exclusion of candidates who have most, though not all, of

the stated qualifications but bring other desirable attributes (e.g., diversity).

- o Focus on "objectivity" is rigid, unrealistic.
- o Scoring is confining and rigid; it eliminates flexibility and overall gestalt.
- o Disagreement with the basic concept; procedure will show an adverse effect on protected classes or, at best, not show a greater adverse effect than the present techniques.
- o Conceptually question the feasibility and wisdom of eliminating all reference to group membership.
- o Letters of application would not serve to enhance an anonymous screening process or the goals of ensuring objectivity and minimizing bias.
- o It is impossible to screen applicants for a position that would ever result in a pool of so-called "equally qualified finalists."

Contemplative Comments

The overwhelming majority of the comments submitted by the respondents were conceptually supportive and procedurally encouraging. Other comments raised some thought provoking issues that are deliberatively addressed in Chapter V: Discussion, Biases and Prejudices of the Delphi (p. 110), and that suggest various possibilities for future research.

The paraphrased comments of the Delphi, ex-officio advisors, and "unofficial" Delphi, as indicated by "D," "X," or "U," respectively in parenthesis following each statement, are presented under three sub-headings:

1. General Comments;
2. Supportive Comments; and
3. Provocative Comments.

General Comments

- o The biggest challenge is to determine what is necessary to perform the position responsibilities (D).
- o All information which identifies such characteristics as race, gender, age, ethnicity, veteran status, and grade point average, can introduce bias in the screening process (D).
- o Use of social security number as the only applicant identifier is a good idea (D).

- o Special recruiting efforts are important for affirmative action; regular recruitment sources are **more** important for professional jobs than special ethnic/racial sources (U).

Supportive Comments

- o The development of an anonymous screening process for selecting the most qualified finalists in administrative employment searches is an excellent blend of theoretical and practical research (X).
- o The research and development of an anonymous screening process is useful and beneficial (X).
- o The Anonymous Screening Process (may be) the first bias-free employment screening process (D).
- o The ASP is a bold attempt at resolving what is known in many employment circles as a monumental problem (D).
- o The ASP provides the fairest possible way of rating applicants and ensures that applications are being evaluated strictly on merits (D).
- o The ASP should withstand the scrutiny of legal challenges (X).
- o It seems that "disparate impact" could be effectively countered by the ASP's anonymous methodology (X).

- o The validity argument of the ASP is hard to find fault with and should leave no question of patterns of personal bias in the initial screening (X).
- o The ASP would be relatively inexpensive to implement in terms of the added time in application processing (X).
- o The gains possible through the perception of efforts to reduce bias...are tangible; applicants could not help but feel they were treated fairly (X).

Provocative Comments

- o The issue is one of opening up the process, getting less rigid notions of job requirements (U).
- o The ASP would be better suited to highly technical positions in which contact with others is minimal (D).
- o The only way to eliminate prejudices and stereotypes in the employment process is for hiring authorities to undergo extensive diversity training (D).
- o You cannot change the emotional bias by changing the cognitive aspect (e.g., diversity training), although it might help (X).

- o The ASP may be appropriate to insure equal employment opportunity; my campus has moved beyond this to affirmative action (D).
- o I would never support a process that holds data until after the selection process; I must know who "they" are very early to effectively track and advocate; I make the call on which information to share with the search committee and when (D).
- o The Delphi panelists are precisely the people who are the embodiment of the process that you are trying to correct; will their personal biases be overcome by their professional expertise (X).

The Anonymous Screening Process (ASP)

The eight-step alternative employment process described herein is an objective-based anonymous screening process for selecting the most qualified finalists in administrative employment searches in public higher education:

- o Position Development;
- o Search Committee Appointment and Training;
- o Recruitment;
- o Application;
- o Evaluation;
- o Selection of the Most Qualified Finalists;
- o On-Site Interview; and
- o Final Selection.

Through applicant anonymity, the process is designed to ensure that all applicants are treated fairly, evaluated objectively, and provided an equal employment opportunity. The Anonymous Screening Process addresses the dual aim of the Federal government's affirmative action efforts to eliminate the discriminatory effects of the past and to prevent future discrimination and, additionally, the goal of the U.S. Congress of improving the economic status of disabled individuals by removing discriminatory barriers to full employment. Moreover, the ASP provides a defensible basis for using protected class status in the final employment decision as an additional criterion in environments of underrepresentation.

Position Development

The position development is perhaps the most critical phase of any employment process in that it describes precisely the organization's needs, defines the measurable parameters of an objective evaluation, and identifies the technical skills and behavioral characteristics necessary to perform the essential functions of the position. In the Anonymous Screening Process, position development has two essential elements--position analysis and position description--which require broad-based communications between the administration, staff, and "customers."

Position Analysis

The position analysis is conducted by the college/department in consultation with human resources and affirmative action professionals. It is a detailed assessment identifying the job itself, how the position relates to the organization structure, and the job-related educational requirements, performance skills, technical abilities, and experiential needs for effectively and efficiently performing the job. The position analysis focuses on three different types of job-related information: *task-oriented* analysis emphasizes responsibilities and duties; *professional-oriented* analysis concerns mental processes, decision making, and interpersonal communications; and *ability-oriented* analysis examines

technical skills, experience, and education necessary to perform the essential functions of the position.

The position analysis requires detailed feedback on each information type from supervisors to whom the individual is directly or indirectly accountable, colleagues with whom the individual works closely, subordinates who report to the individual, and primary "customers" (e.g., faculty, students, government agencies, general public) served by the individual.

It is from this fundamental assessment that institutional, departmental, and individual priorities are identified, criterion are specified, and weighting factors, if any, to be used in the evaluation process are established.

Position Description

The position description is the synthesized outcome of the position analysis. This document specifically describes the objective job-related evaluation criteria (task-oriented, ability oriented) upon which applicants will be screened and most qualified finalists selected, and generally describes the behavioral and personal attributes (professional-oriented) necessary to perform the essential functions of the position.

Only the objective evaluation criteria are considered in the Anonymous Screening Process, and must include:

1. the Primary or minimum *required* qualifications;
2. the Secondary or *preferred* qualifications; and
3. the Tertiary or *desirable* qualifications.

An example of these criteria is presented in the Position Description in Appendix E. It is important to emphasize and vital for the practitioner to understand that the anonymous applicant screening process is a tool using objective job-related criteria for evaluating and selecting the most qualified persons as finalists, and not in making the final selection. This point will be revisited with greater specificity in the Final Selection sub-section of this chapter.

Search Committee Appointment and Training

Appointment

The appointment and composition of the search committee play a critical role in ensuring that the screening process is objective-based and free from bias and influence from outside sources. The committee should be comprised of five-to-seven individuals of diverse representation in terms of race, sex, education discipline, professional experience, and reporting accountability. The selection of members should be made by the college or department in consultation with human resources and affirmative action professionals. A Chairperson, usually an individual representing the hiring department, is selected among the committee members to coordinate the screening process.

In addition, a search Facilitator, who is independent of the search committee, is assigned by the Director of Human Resources from among his/her staff to facilitate the processing of the application and personal data forms, to ensure applicant anonymity, and to coordinate communications with potential applicants.

Training

Prior to initiating the recruitment, search committee members are provided a thorough procedural, legal, ethical, multicultural, and philosophical education.

All search committee members will participate in a comprehensive work session led jointly by professionals from the Offices of Human Resources and Affirmative Action. The seminar deals with federal, state, and institutional employment mandates, affirmative action goals, and issues of diversity.

Training includes:

- o An overview of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972;
- o An overview of the intent and implications of Presidential Executive Orders 11246 and 11375;
- o An overview of Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 which prohibits discrimination against individuals with a disability;

- o A discussion of the concerns related to gender, race, national origin, developmental or physical disability, socioeconomic class, and perceived ability;
- o A discussion of the ways in which biases manifest themselves and how biases may differ within and between specific groups; and
- o A self-examination and recognition of personal biases as demonstrated by behavioral simulations.

A detailed explanation of the Anonymous Screening Process--its goals of minimizing bias and ensuring equal employment opportunity--and explicit instructions for implementing the process are presented to the search committee. During this part of the training process, an open discussion is convened of the institution's goal to select the best qualified individuals, the objectives and requirements of the position, and the committee's legal obligations and institutional policies and procedural responsibilities.

Committee members are also presented an overview of the expectations of the position by the Chief Executive Officer or principal line administrator.

Recruitment

The recruitment phase of the anonymous screening process is essential for providing adequate and timely public notice of the position vacancy. The advertisement,

recruitment plan, and application instructions are designed by the Human Resources Division in consultation with Affirmative Action experts and the college or department to ensure diverse geographic and demographic distribution through the use of traditional and non-traditional recruitment sources.

Factors such as the level of responsibility of the position, status in the organizational structure, salary range, demographic profile of the institution and adjacent community, and the extent to which employment parity exists among qualified white males, women, and minorities, will directly impact the breadth of the recruitment.

Regardless of the above factors, the Anonymous Screening Process requires a minimum placement of the position vacancy notice for four weeks in a major regional newspaper with an application closing date no less than six weeks from the date of initial advertisement publication to give potential applicants adequate time to respond.

Information included in the Notice of Position Vacancy in Appendix E must include the minimum required job-related qualifications and personal competencies specified in the position description, application information, filing deadline, and a statement of institutional commitment to equitable and objective consideration of all applicants.

Application

Instructions

The Application Instructions to potential candidates must be clear and concise (see Appendix E). They must include a comprehensible explanation of the Anonymous Screening Process including the institution's overall goal to select the best qualified individuals based on equitable and objective consideration regardless of their race, color, religion, sex, age, or handicap. The objectives and essential job-related requirements of the position, the primary, secondary and tertiary evaluation criteria, and the candidate's procedural responsibilities for application must be clearly communicated.

The specific application requirements of the Anonymous Screening Process include a letter of application, professional resume or vita, and an application/personal data form.

Letter of Application

Each applicant must submit a detailed Letter of Application (see Appendix E), no more than ten single-spaced pages, that addresses her/his *specific* job-related qualifications as itemized in the evaluation criteria. The letter should contain a description of relevant experience, education, performance skills, technical abilities, major accomplishments, and professional development that demonstrates his/her capacity to effectively and efficiently

perform the essential position responsibilities. The use of position titles, courses completed, content of conferences and workshops attended (e.g., strategic planning, research accounting, equal education opportunity), or similar descriptors are permissible in the body of the Letter of Application. Specific dates of employment, institutional names, and race- or gender-based sponsor names are explicitly excluded. The applicant's social security number, or an institution-assigned alternate number, is the only applicant identifier. This number must be included at the top of each page. Requests for assignment of alternate applicant identification numbers are directed to the Independent Search Facilitator for the position in the Human Resources Division.

The Letter of Application is sent with the Professional Resume directly to search committee Chairperson.

Professional Resume or Vita

A Professional Resume or Vita (see Appendix E) is required that provides a profile of the applicant's general job-related qualifications including experience history, education background, major accomplishments, professional associations, and public service. Specific dates of employment and institutional names are explicitly excluded. The applicant's social security number, or the institution-assigned alternate number, is the only applicant identifier and must be included at the top of each page.

Both the Professional Resume and Letter of Application are sent directly to search committee Chairperson in a return-addressed, postage-paid envelope with the applicant's social security or institution-assigned alternate number being the only visible applicant identifier. The Chairperson receives, dates, and files the application materials numerically by the applicant identifier number. The envelopes will remain unopened until the application deadline has passed. Thereafter, the envelopes are opened by the Chairperson, applicant materials scanned to identify and delete any biasing references (e.g., race, gender, institutional affiliation), and distributed proportionately among committee members for preliminary screening.

Application/Personal Data Form

The Application/Personal Data Form presented in Appendix E is a tri-fold, return-addressed, postage-paid document designed to obtain required personal data (e.g., social security number, name, address, telephone number, position applied for) and voluntary detailed affirmative action information (e.g., race, sex, age, handicap, veteran). The form must contain a clear statement that these data are for statistical reporting purposes only and will not be used to discriminate against the applicant. When the form is properly folded and sealed, the applicant's social security number, or institution-assigned alternate number, is the only visible external applicant identifier.

The Application/Personal Data Form is sent separately to the Independent Search Facilitator in the Office of Human Resources. The Facilitator receives the forms unopened and dates each one. The forms are filed numerically by applicant identifier number. The envelopes remain sealed until an applicant is selected as a most qualified finalist, voluntarily withdraws in writing from consideration, or is eliminated through the Anonymous Screening Process. When opened, the forms are used for notification purposes only. The forms are distributed to the Affirmative Action Office for statistical analysis after the hire.

Evaluation

The evaluation phase of the Anonymous Screening Process is a comprehensive three-step analysis of a applicant's qualifications as compared with the specific job-related criteria. The first two evaluative steps, Primary and Secondary, can take place simultaneously to save time and repetitive reviews.

Primary (Initial) Applicant Evaluation

The initial evaluation phase focuses on the qualifications **essential** for performing the job. The task of each search committee member is to determine if an applicant meets the essential job-related qualifications to be further considered for the job. An evaluation form or criteria matrix that explicitly identify the primary, secondary, and tertiary criteria is recommended to ensure

all applicants are evaluated equitably using identical criteria and that the results of the evaluation are well documented. An example of both documents are presented in Appendix E.

Applicants who meet the primary qualifications are continued in the active candidate pool for further evaluation. Applicants who fail to meet the essential job-related qualifications are eliminated from active candidacy. Their application materials are placed in an inactive file in the Office of Human Resources labeled "Primary." After the best qualified person is hired, all applicants are sent a "thank you for applying" letter.

Secondary Applicant Evaluation

The secondary evaluation phase focuses on the preferred objective qualifications considered vital for effectively and efficiently performing the responsibilities of the job. The degree of documentation required of the evaluator at the secondary level is considerably greater than that at the primary level. In addition to checking the evaluation form, the evaluator must document in a brief but concise narrative why the candidate was selected or rejected for further consideration.

Applicants who meet the secondary qualifications are advanced to active candidacy. Applicants who fail to meet the secondary qualifications are tentatively suspended from the active candidate pool, but may receive further

consideration depending upon the quality of the applicant pool. Their application materials are placed in a second inactive file in the Office of Human Resources labeled "Secondary." An applicant who substantially meets most, though not all, of the preferred criteria, may receive further consideration at the institution's discretion; or additional applicants may be sought. Applicants who meet both the primary and secondary criteria are assured of further consideration as semi-finalists through the tertiary phase.

Tertiary Applicant Evaluation

The tertiary evaluation phase focuses on the **desirable** or peripheral qualifications considered critical for assuring organizational success and compatibility in terms of management style, multicultural experiences, problem solving approach and other indicators of institutional fit and job enhancement. Each criterion in the tertiary phase may be assigned an equal weighting factor of one, or separate criterion may be assigned different weighting factors reflecting the relative importance of the criterion in performing the job, the extent to which the applicant meets the criterion, or a combination of the two weighting factors (see Appendix E: Multiple Factor Tertiary Criterion Evaluation Matrix). The factors and weights must be determined during the position analysis and communicated to

the search committee prior to the evaluations. Weighting must be applied consistently in all evaluations.

Selection committee members receive a copy of each semi-finalist's application materials and are directed to perform an independent review of each candidate. The degree of documentation required of the evaluator at the tertiary level is considerably more extensive than at the primary or secondary levels. Each committee member will numerically rank each applicant based on the explicit tertiary criteria. In addition to checking the evaluation form, the evaluator must document in a detailed and specific narrative the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, whether or not in their opinion the candidate should be considered by the entire committee for selection as one of the most qualified finalists, and the reasons supporting their evaluation score and recommendation.

The selection committee members meet to discuss their evaluations, recommendations, and rationale for their decisions. Notations reflecting the discussion of each candidate are documented by the Chairperson for future reference during the interview process. Following these discussions with all members present, candidate profiles are developed for each active applicant by combining the independent scores of the evaluators for each criterion and summing the totals.

Selection of the Most Qualified Finalists

The Anonymous Screening Process culminates in the selection of the three to five most qualified finalists based upon comprehensive objective evaluation of the materials submitted by each candidate.

Provisional Selection

Provisional selection of the most qualified finalists occurs when the candidate profiles are complete and the top scoring candidates emerge from the evaluation process. The committee, in view of the profile totals, again has an opportunity to discuss the profiles and relative merits of the applicants. This discussion is critical, particularly when several candidates are numerically close in the final rankings but only a limited number of applicants will be chosen for interviews.

Selection

A consensus vote of the selection committee is required to select the most qualified finalists--usually the top three to five candidates. Several alternate candidates from among the most qualified semi-finalists are also selected and prioritized based on their relative numerical weighting. Their application materials are held in an abeyance file in the Office of Human Resources labeled "Alternates." Should one or more of the selected finalists withdraw, these individuals as prioritized may be incorporated into the most qualified finalist pool.

Following the selection of the most qualified finalists, the search committee Chairperson notifies the independent search Facilitator in Human Resources of the committee's selection and provides her/him with the finalists' applicant identifier numbers. The independent search Facilitator matches the most qualified finalists' applicant identifier numbers with the numerically filed Application/Personal Data Forms, and opens only those to obtain the personal information necessary to notify each finalist.

Notification and Confirmation

The Facilitator contacts each finalist to confirm their continued interest in the position, to notify them of their selection, and to request any additional information required prior to scheduling the on-site interview (e.g., references, work samples, completed situational questionnaire, transcripts).

Upon receipt of the additional information and confirmation of all finalists' continued interest, interview arrangements are made for a comprehensive on-site evaluation. These arrangements include accommodating most qualified finalists with special needs.

A confirmation letter, signed by the Chairperson and Facilitator, is sent to each finalist to verify the specific interview conditions and details in writing (e.g., date, time, place, transportation arrangements, lodging, expense

reimbursement). The identities of the most qualified finalists are held in strict confidence by the Facilitator and Chairperson until this confirmation process is complete.

On-Site Interview

The comprehensive on-site interview and evaluation process involves multiple meetings with diverse audiences potentially encompassing the President and the student body. The primary focus of this evaluation process shifts from objective-based technical competencies to the specific behaviors and personal characteristics necessary to perform the essential functions of the position.

Assessments of behavioral competencies and personal attributes are subjective and may include perceptions about a candidate's leadership abilities, creativity, multicultural achievement, effective communications, compatibility with the institution's culture, and, in situations of documented under-representation or past unlawful discrimination, protected class status.

Final Selection

Selecting the optimum person to hire is based on an extensive objective and subjective review of each finalist to achieve the ultimate goal of placing the best qualified person in the job. This critical final exercise of matching an applicant's objectively evaluated technical job skills and subjectively evaluated behavioral competencies and personal attributes with the essential position criteria is

outside the scope of this study. However, this distinction between selection of the most qualified finalists and the best qualified person for the job is vital for understanding the value of the Anonymous Screening Process and its limitations in the final selection.

After the hire is completed, the other applicants are sent letters of thanks and appreciation for their participation in the process.

Supporting Documents

The nine documents supporting the Anonymous Screening Process that were referenced throughout this chapter are presented in Appendix E: The Anonymous Screening Process. These documents are an integral part of the Anonymous Screening Process, but are presented as suggested examples only. Exclusive of the Application/Personal Data Form, individual institutions may add, adapt, or exclude other exhibits to meet their unique situational needs.

The documents are presented in the Appendices as follows:

<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Appendix E</u>
Position Description	page 167
Notice of Position Vacancy	page 171
Application Instructions	page 172
Letter of Application	page 173
Professional Resume	page 183
Application/Personal Data Form	page 185
Evaluation Form	page 187
Criteria Matrix	page 188
Multiple Factor Tertiary Matrix	page 189

Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process

Final acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process was contingent upon at least eighty percent (80%) of the Delphi conceptually concurring with the process as presented in the final draft or agreeing to support the process pending future implementation and assessment. As discussed in Chapter III, Phase V of the Methodology, the final information packet sent to each Delphi participant contained, among other substantive documents, a Memorandum of Acceptance that was to be signed and returned promptly. Signed memorandums of acceptance were received from each Delphi, compiled, and summarized.

The results confirm a 100% level of consensus among Delphi respondents who conceptually concur with or support the ASP pending future research as presented in the final draft. These results are summarized below in Table 3, and presented diagrammatically by Race/Color and Profession in Table 4, Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process, on page 106.

TABLE 3

Summary of the Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process

	Number of Responses Percent	
Concur Conceptually	6	60
Support Pending Future Research	4	40
Do Not Concur or Support	0	0
Totals	<u>10</u>	<u>100</u>

TABLE 4

Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process

Key:

Race/Color

B = Black/African American

W = White

H = Hispanic

Profession

AA = Affirmative Action

HR = Human Resources

Other*

Number of Responses								
	Race/Color			Profession			Total	%
	B	H	W	AA	HR	Other*		
Concur Conceptually								
Female	1		2	1	2		3	30
Male		1	2		2	1	3	30
Total	1	1	4	1	4	1	6	60
Support Pending Future Research								
Female			1			1	1	10
Male	3			3			3	30
Total	3		1	3		1	4	40
Do Not Concur of Support							0	0
TOTALS							<u>10</u>	<u>100</u>

*Other: Other respondents are a Director of Human Resources and Affirmative Action and a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

General Discussion of the Results

The results of this study are profound and encouraging: the Delphi respondents unanimously recognized the inherent deficiencies of the traditional employment process. Also recognized by a consensus of the Delphi is the conceptual affirmation of the Anonymous Screening Process (ASP) as an effective means for substantially eliminating evaluator bias, external influences, and other non-relevant biasing data from the employment process. The ASP holds considerable promise for assuring applicants an objective evaluation, fair treatment, and an equal employment opportunity through selection of the most qualified finalists and provides a defensible basis for affirmatively using protected class status as an additional consideration in the final candidate selection in situations of underrepresentation.

Limitations

The development of an anonymous screening process for selecting the most qualified finalists in administrative employment searches has two principal limitations that were purposely imposed to assure the feasibility, timeliness, and focus of the research:

1. The research was specifically structured within the bounds of public higher education drawing exclusively upon the collective wisdom and

expertise of professionals in public education, although many of the participants have considerable experience in other governmental entities, private higher education, and private enterprise; and

2. The research and resulting Anonymous Screening Process do not directly address the inherent biases in the personal interviews, final deliberations, or ultimate incumbent selection. However, as was noted in the literature review, research has shown that (1) among similarly qualified applicants consideration of non job-related biasing factors (e.g., race, gender, handicap) is significantly diminished and (2) selection committee multicultural, legal, and institutional training as provided for in the ASP should substantively reduce the influence of these factors in the final decision-making process.

Supplemental to the aforementioned limitations is the basic premise that no employment screening process can entirely eliminate all bias, although in the words of one Delphi respondent, "...I believe you will have designed the first bias-free (employment) screening process."

The ASP may also prove to be more complex, time consuming, and perhaps more costly than the traditional employment approaches most commonly used. However, the expenditure of additional resources is readily justifiable

based on the multiple benefits obtained with implementation of the ASP, including procedural fairness, evaluative objectivity, professional development and diversity training, and compliance with federal employment mandates.

Biases and Prejudices of the Delphi

One of the ex-officio advisors posed an interesting question: "Will the Delphi panelists' personal biases be overcome by their professional expertise?"

Generally supported by the results, I believe the answer is yes. The diversity of the Delphi respondents in terms of their gender, race, ethnicity, experiential backgrounds, and geographic representation reinforces an affirmative response, as does their consensus of conceptual affirmation or support for the Anonymous Screening Process.

In particular, the extent of professional expertise contributed to the development of the ASP is evidenced by the Delphi's unanimous concurrence that Affirmative Action data are an integral component of the traditional employment process, that these data are highly biasing when interjected into an employment screening process, and that a consensus (60%) professionally agree that these data are non-essential in an employment process. The recognition that these data may be used either in support of or against individuals of all persuasions at the direction of well-intentioned administrators (external bias) or at the discretion of highly prejudiced screening committee members (evaluator bias) is in and of itself a significant finding.

However, this is not to claim that development of the process was free from the influence of personal bias. To the contrary, personal bias did surface among several of the responses, particularly from one Delphi panelist and one

"unofficial" respondent. Their comments belie a fundamental philosophical divergence in the interpretation of the defined legal role of affirmative action in an employment process and the appropriate timing and scope of affirmative action advocacy. Their comments also vividly illustrate the seemingly contradictory dilemma administrators and search committees face in attempting to balance the universal quest for diversity with that of equal employment opportunity.

This critical and highly volatile issue is strikingly evidenced by the statement of one Affirmative Action director who wrote, "I must know who the protected class applicants are very early in the process to effectively track and advocate for them; I make the call on which information to share with the search committee and when."

I emphatically concur with the need to accurately track all applicants--especially those of protected classes--to continually assess and improve recruiting efforts to obtain diverse, highly qualified applicants (advocacy), and for statistical accountability to the federal government. However, I take solemn exception to the discretionary attitude and "advocacy" role suggested from the director's statements. These are precisely the discriminatory mechanisms that have been, and still are, applied negatively to members of protected classes. The unrestrained exercise and liberal abuses in the recent past of these attitudinal and procedural employment tools spawned the civil rights movement, EEO legislation, and numerous other legal,

remedial, and preventative actions...and may now be fueling the fires of impassioned cultural misunderstanding, racial disharmony, and national divisiveness when they appear to be applied subjectively and subversively against the white "majority."

The advocacy role is one most appropriately addressed through the education process. This role is explicitly provided for in the Anonymous Screening Process search committee training and through other campus- and community-based professional development and promotional opportunities.

The notion that it is acceptable to use personal data affirmatively for certain members of protected classes in an employment process even if it excludes other better qualified applicants is counter to equal employment opportunity law and beyond affirmative action mandates. Advancement of this bias notion among some affirmative action professionals is clearly illustrated by the statement, "The ASP may be appropriate to insure equal employment opportunity, but my campus has moved beyond this to affirmative action." The tacit implication is advocacy for preferential treatment that portends subjugation of essential job related qualifications to substantially non-job related personal hereditary characteristics.

Affirmative action must occur at the front-end of an employment process in identifying and soliciting highly qualified applicants of diverse backgrounds and experiences

and through the education process. Beyond this, all applicants must excel on their own job-related merits and withstand the scrutiny of an equally applied, anonymous, objective-based, employment screening process.

Although diversity, sensitivity, and legal training are not absolutes as the means for eliminating prejudices and stereotypes as some have suggested, training may substantially mitigate the predominance of discriminatory biases in American society by promoting attitudes of acceptance and inclusion and humanistic values of empathy, compassion, and understanding.

Conclusions

Goal and Objectives

The goal of this significant research effort has been achieved:

...to design an objective-based Anonymous Screening Process (ASP) for selecting the most qualified finalists for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education;

as have the principal objectives based upon the essential guiding criteria:

...to design a viable employment process that substantially meets equal opportunity mandates, the dual aim of the Federal government's affirmative action efforts to eliminate the discriminatory effects of the past and to bar future discrimination, and the goal of the U.S. Congress of improving the economic status of disabled individuals by removing discriminatory barriers to full employment.

Implications

Specific Implications

The specific implications of the Anonymous Screening Process (ASP) that may be extrapolated from the results of this research are:

- o The ASP substantially meets Equal Employment Opportunity, Affirmative Action, and Americans with Disabilities Act mandates.
- o The ASP may effectively eliminate the inherent biases of the employment application, evaluation, and selection processes.
- o The ASP offers public institutions of higher education an *alternative* applicant screening procedure that minimizes evaluator bias, effectively eliminates the interjection of non-objective criteria by external sources into the selection of the most qualified finalists, and substantially ensures equal opportunity and objective consideration to all candidates.
- o The ASP focuses on essential job-related criterion.
- o The ASP may facilitate national educational affirmative action goals and socioeconomic reforms by providing a diverse pool of the most qualified finalists whereafter protected class status may be considered as a legitimate additional criterion in

the final selection in environments of underrepresentation.

- o The ASP's anonymous applicant evaluation and objective-based selection of the most qualified finalists may eliminate the disparate treatment argument and mitigate the proliferation of discrimination litigation from both protected and unprotected classes.
- o The ASP integrates a vital education and training component that serves the dual purpose of ensuring equity of process and providing multicultural professional development opportunities.
- o The ASP may be generalized for use in other employment categories and by other educational and non-educational organizations.
- o The ASP is critically needed, it is timely, and it should be implemented.

Recommendations and Future Research

Recommendations

There are two key recommendations that logically follow the development of the Anonymous Screening Process. These processes should occur simultaneously.

Implement the Anonymous Screening Process

Implementation of the Anonymous Screening Process, as described in Chapter IV (Results, The Anonymous Screening Process, p. 86) should begin immediately. The process should be implemented on a trial basis encompassing recruitment through hiring in administrative employment searches at a minimum of three public higher education institutions.

Survey the Participants

Concurrent with implementation of the ASP, the process participants, including human resources and affirmative action professionals, search committee members, and most qualified finalists, should be surveyed to assess their perceptions, opinions, and suggestions for continued use and promotion of the ASP.

This second recommendation falls into the realm of future research and will be elaborated upon in full detail in the following section.

Future Research

At least three major areas for follow-up research have been identified in the results:

1. Assessment of the general perceptions of participants about the viability of the Anonymous Applicant Screening Process;
2. Assessment of the extent to which the ASP does or does not enhance diversity; and
3. Implementation of the ASP in other areas and assessment of the transferability of the process to other educational and governmental entities, and to private enterprise.

Assessment of General Perceptions

Development of the Anonymous Screening Process provides baseline criteria for implementing an alternative process that has not been previously articulated. However, the assessment of general perceptions of the participants about the Anonymous Screening Process is an essential area of future research for determining the procedural viability and acceptance of the ASP.

The ASP's implementation and follow-up assessment will provide critical insight into the effectiveness and perceived fairness of an anonymous applicant screening approach. The responses and suggestions that emerge may be used later in the design modification for "fine-tuning" the process and in adaption of the process for use in other employment categories, governmental entities, and private industry organizations.

A detailed description of and suggested methodology for conducting an assessment of the general perceptions of

participants about the viability of the Anonymous Screening Process is presented in Appendix F: Assessment of the Anonymous Screening Process. Also included in Appendix F are a Letter of Informed Consent and the comprehensive professional assessment instrument.

CHAPTER VI
Bibliography

- Abrams, D.L., et al. (1977). Estimates of the determinants of men's and women's economic success. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Adelman, Clifford. (1991). Women at thirtysomething: Paradoxes of attainment. U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington DC.
- Albert, Sheila. (1989). Picking the right person for the top spot. Nonprofit World, 7(6):31-33.
- American Council on Education. (1986). Deciding who shall lead: Recommendations for improving presidential searches. Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington DC.
- Appleberry, James B. (1987). Guidelines on the appointment of a president. American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington DC.
- Arciniega, Tomas A. (1990). The challenge of developing effective strategies to recruit and retain ethnic minority faculty. Presented at the California Community Colleges Faculty and Staff Conference, San Diego CA.
- Arvey, R.D. and R.H. Faley. (1988). Fairness in selecting employees (2nd. ed.). Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, Inc.
- Arvey, Richard D. (1979). Fairness in selecting employees. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, Inc.
- Arvey, R.D. and J.E. Campion. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. Personnel Psychology, 35(2):281-322.
- Arvey, Richard D. (1986). Sex bias in job evaluation procedures. Personnel Psychology, 39(2):315-35.

- Association for Institutional Research. (1990). Thirty-First Annual AIR Forum: Building bridges for the twenty-first century. Call for Proposals: Papers, Panels, Demonstrations, and Other Forum Sessions, Tallahassee FL.
- Bowerman, B.L. and R.T. O'Connell. (1979). Forecasting and time series. Belmont CA: Duxbury Press.
- Boyer, Ernest L. (1987). A classification of institutions of higher education. Princeton NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bromert, Jane Doyle. (1984). The role and effectiveness of search committees. Washington DC: AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Currents, American Association of University Administrators.
- Cahn, Steven M. (1989). Colleges should be explicit about who will be considered for jobs. In The Chronicle of Higher Education, 35(30):B3.
- Clarke, Charanne C. (1988). Is there a "glass ceiling" for women? Upward mobility in the administrative ranks of Duke University. CUPA Journal, 39(3):46-51.
- Cleveland, Jeanette N., et al. (1985). Applicant pool composition and job perceptions: Impact on decisions regarding an older applicant. Los Angeles CA: Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 93rd.
- Coady, Sharon. (1990). How to hire good faculty. Austin TX: Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on Teaching Excellence and Conference of Administrators, 12th.
- Collison, Michele N-K. (1992). Young people found pessimistic about relations between the races. In The Chronicle of Higher Education, 38(29):A1.
- Committee on Labor and Human Resources. (1982). Committee analysis of executive order 11246: The Affirmative Action Program. Prepared by Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cooper, John F. and John F. Garmon. (1990). Personnel selection: The holistic approach. TX: EDRS.

- Couch, Sue. (1981). Employer perceptions of male and female applicants for administrative positions in vocational education. Atlanta GA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Vocational Association.
- Dale, Michael C. (1987). Matching selection criteria to job expectations: A practical approach to screening applicants for certain support positions. CUPA Journal, 16(28):13-22.
- Day, V.B., F. Erwin, and A.M. Koral (eds.). (1978). A professional and legal analysis of the uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures. Berea OH: The American Society for Personnel Administration.
- DeMille, Barbara. (1989). Age discrimination in higher education is both overt and subtle. In The Chronicle of Higher Education, 35(39):B2.
- Etaugh, Claire and Sue Riley. (1980, 1977). Evaluating competence: Effects of marital and parental status and occupational sex-typing. St. Louis MO: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, 52nd.
- Etcherson, Esther and James E. Conyers. (1989). Inside the profession: AA/EEO personnel attitudes about affirmative action. CUPA Journal, 40(3):18-21.
- Fernandez, John P. (1991). Managing a diverse work force: Regaining the competitive edge. Lexington MA: D.C. Heath & Company.
- Ford, J. Kevin, et al. (1985). The study of race effects in objective indices and subjective evaluations of performance: A meta-analysis of performance criteria. Ontario Canada: Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 92nd, Toronto.
- Ford Foundation. (1989). Pay equity activity in the public sector: 1979-1989. Washington DC: National Committee on Pay Equity.
- Gerdes, Eugenia-Proctor and Vactoria L. Husted. (1987). Sex bias in evaluations: Effects of ambiguity, job sex-type, and rater gender. Arlington VA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association.

- Gordon, Randall A. and Stephen D. Owens. (1988). The effect of job level and amount of information on the evaluation of male and female job applicants. Journal of Employment Counseling, 25(4):160-71.
- Grant, Geraldine P. (1988). Female employment disparities in West Virginia education administration: Why they exist. Dissertation Abstracts, DAI 49/11A, p.3216; West Virginia University.
- Groll, Bruce J. (1990). Walking a fine line: Discrimination in employment in higher education on the basis of gender. Unpublished Paper, Oregon State University.
- Grunig, Larissa Schneider. (1987). Shattering the glass ceiling in journalism education: Sex discrimination in promotion and tenure. San Antonio TX: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.
- Grunig, Larissa A. (1989). Sex discrimination in promotion and tenure in journalism education. Journalism Quarterly, 66(1):93-100, 229.
- Hill, John G., Jr. (1989). Discrimination and faculty recruitment: The disparate impact controversy. Education Law Reporter, 56:419-424.
- Hitt, M.A., et al. (1982). Discrimination in industrial employment: An investigation of race and sex bias among professionals. Work and Occupations: An International Sociological Journal, 9(2):217-31.
- Hunsicker, J. Freedley Jr., Esq. (1990). Ready or not: The Americans with Disabilities Act. Personnel Journal.
- Jaschik, Scott. (1989). High court's ruling may make colleges wary of hiring plans. In The Chronicle of Higher Education, p.A16.
- Jensen, Joan M. (1990). Advertised job searches are still the best way to assure fair hiring. In The Chronicle of Higher Education, 36(40):B2.
- Johnson, Catherine B. (1989). Bias in the selection interview: Self- or other-directed? Dissertation Abstracts, DAI 50/12B, p.5912; Kansas State University.

- Kalantzis, Mary and Bill Cope. (1989). Pluralism and equitability: Multicultural curriculum strategies for schools. NACCME Commissioned Research Paper No.3; National Advisory and Coordinating Committee on Multicultural Education; Woden, Australia
- Kaplin, William A. (1989). The law of higher education. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Kluegel, J.R. and E.R. Smith. (1982). Whites' beliefs about Blacks'. American Sociological Review, 47(4):518-32.
- Kluegel, J.R. and E.R. Smith. (1986). Bliefs about inequality: Americans' views of what is and what ought to be. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lee, Barbara A. (1989). Recent Supreme Court rulings could disrupt or halt affirmative action recruiting and hiring in academe. In The Chronicle of Higher Education, p.B3.
- Leedom, Dennis K. (1989). Mental models underlying the conceptualization of job performance. Dissertation Abstracts, DAI 50/06B, p.2654; George Mason University.
- Lessow-Hurley, Judith. (1989). Recruitment and retention of minority faculty: Affirmative action strategies. CUPA Journal, 40(3):22-26.
- Madison Area Technical College. (1991). Mr. Kenneth P. Niemeyer, Personnel Division, 3550 Anderson Street, Madison, WI, 53704-2599.
- Marshall, Catherine and Gretchen B. Rossman. (1990). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Martinko, Mark J. and William L. Gardner. (1983). A methodological review of sex-related access discrimination problems. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 9(7):825-39.
- McDowell, Earl E. and Bridget A. Mrozla. (1987). An exploratory study of the academic resume and employment interview practices. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, 73rd, Boston MA.

- Metropolitan Service District. (1991). Ms. Kim Huey, Director of Personnel, 2000 S.W. First Avenue, Portland, OR, 97201.
- Mitchell, Thomas and Jane Henning. (1987). Effects of present salary on resume evaluations: Sex discrimination? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, 33rd, Atlanta GA.
- Montoya, Margaret E., Esq. (1991). Race- and gender-conscious hiring by private employers. University of New Mexico. Albuquerque NM.
- Mueller, Daniel J. (1986). Measuring social attitudes. A handbook for researchers and practitioners. Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York.
- Northcraft, G.B. (1980). The structure of disability perception. Paper presented at the Western Psychological Association Conference; Stanford University, CA.
- Northcraft, G.B. (1982). Affirmative action: The impact of legislated equality. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, CA.
- Northcraft, G.B. (1983). The stigma of affirmative action: An empirical analysis. Arizona University, Tucson; National Institutes of Health (DHHS), Bethesda MD.
- Oregon State University. (1983). Oregon State University affirmative action plan. Corvallis OR.
- Oregon State University. (1991). Oregon State University affirmative action plan 1991-1993 biennium. Corvallis OR.
- Person, Ruth J. and George C. Newman. (1988). Selection of the university librarian. Association of Research Libraries, Washington DC, Office of Management Studies.
- Pettigrew, T.F. and J. Martin. (1987). Shaping the organizational context for Black American inclusion. Journal of Social Issues, 43(1):41-78.
- Ravitch, Diane. (1990). Multiculturalism yes, particularism no. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A44.

- Ravitch, Diane. (1990). Diversity and democracy: Multicultural education in America.
- Reed, Rodney J. (1983). Affirmative action in higher education: Is it necessary? Journal of Negro Education 52(3):332-49.
- Reed, Rodney J. (1986). Faculty diversity: An educational and moral imperative in search of institutional commitment. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 6(4):274-94.
- Reed, Rodney J. (1989). The selection of elementary and secondary school principals: Process and promise. EDRS, CA.
- Riesman, David. (1983). Selection procedures for college and university presidents: Search and destroy missions? Address delivered at the Rev. Charles F. Donovan Lecture Series (4th); Boston College MA.
- Rosenblatt, Roger. (1991). Columbia University seminars on media & society videotape. Safe Speech, Free Speech and The University, Stanford University, CA.
- Schmidt, Benno C., Jr. (1991). Columbia University seminars on media & society videotape. Safe Speech, Free Speech and The University, Stanford University, CA.
- Schoenfeld, Sae L. and Perry A. Zirkel. (1989). Sex discrimination in higher education employment: An empirical analysis of the case law. Journal of Law and Education. 18(4):567-81.
- Shelton, Maria M. (1989). Teacher selection: A training model for principals. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Tuscaloosa AL.
- Silber, John. (1989). Comments in the "In Box." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 35(46):A15.
- Singer, M.S. and Christine Sewell. (1989). Applicant age and selection interview decisions: Effect of information exposure on age discrimination in personnel selection. Personnel-Psychology, 42(1):135-54.

- Sisneros, Anthony. (1984). Receptivity to affirmative action in higher education: A study of minority, white male and administrative attitudes towards minority preferences. Unpublished Dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman WA.
- Slattery, Peter J. (1988). The principalship and the selection of principles in Australian Catholic schools. Dissertation Abstracts, DAI 50/05A, p.1171, Fordham University.
- Smith, Earl and Steven Sneed. (1989). Inside the academy: Faculty attitudes about affirmative action. CUPA Journal, 40(3):8-17.
- Speth, Carol A., et al. (1986). Causal attributions for success in hiring decisions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association (67th), San Francisco CA.
- Stanford University. (1987). Equal employment opportunity vs. affirmative action. Campus Report Supplement, p.6-7.
- Strossen, Nadine. (1991). Columbia University seminars on media & society videotape. Safe Speech, Free Speech and The University, Stanford University, CA.
- Tanner, C. Kenneth and I. Phillip Young. (1983). Intragroup inconsistency in public policy analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Tatell, D.S. and E.M. Minberg. (1989). Institutions can design affirmative-action programs that are effective--and legal. In The Chronicle of Higher Education, 35(20):B2.
- Taylor, Barbara G. (1989). Presence and power: Answering the need for women leaders in higher education. CUPA Journal, 40(3):27-33.
- Taylor, William L. (1984). Affirmative action in the United States. Rockefeller Foundation, New York, (ERIC) ED249305, UD023756.
- Thomas, Clarence A. (1991). Senate confirmation hearing for nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court. Washington DC.

- Torregrosa, Constance H. (ed). (1991). The hep 1991 Higher Education Directory. Falls Church VA: Higher Education Publications, Inc.
- Turner M.A., M. Fix, and R. Struyk. (1991). Opportunities denied, opportunities diminished. The Urban Institute, Washington DC.
- United States Reports. (1989). Martin ET AL. v. Wilks ET AL. Supreme Court of the United States, Washington DC.
- Waggaman, John S. (1983). Faculty recruitment, retention, and fair employment: Obligations and opportunities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Reports, No.2 FYI Executive Summary.
- Weatherspoon, Floyd D. (1991). The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990: Title I and its impact on employment decisions. Vermont Law Review, 16(1).
- Weitman, Catheryn J. (1983). A selection method that succeeds! Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), U.S. Department of Education, Washington DC.
- Wilson, Reginald. (1989). Affirmative action: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. CUPA Journal, 40(3):1-6.
- Wilson, Reginald. (1987). Recruitment and retention of minority faculty and staff. AAHE-Bulletin. p.11-14.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Delphi Panel Information Packet

Letter to Project Advisors

Thank you for agreeing to contribute your time and professional expertise as an ex officio Committee advisor to my doctoral dissertation research, *"The Development of an Anonymous Screening Process for Selecting the 'Equally Qualified' Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches."*

The purpose of this study is to design and pilot test an objective-based anonymous screening process for selecting the "equally qualified" finalist pool for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education. An anonymous applicant screening process will minimize bias and effectively eliminate the interjection of non-objective criteria in selecting the pool of equally qualified finalists. The results of this study will be pilot tested at selected public universities and evaluated in terms of the perceived fairness and objectivity in recruiting, evaluating, and selecting finalists as compared with current applicant screening processes.

Your participation in this effort is extremely important for ensuring the integrity of the proposal in terms of the **overall research design**, the **legal integrity of the proposed anonymous employment process**, and the **development and validation of the instruments**.

An Official copy of the proposal as approved by my Doctoral Committee is enclosed for your critical review and comments. Please prepare your specific comments in a separate letter, but feel free to make notations directly on the document. Please return the document to me **with your notations** in the postage-paid, self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience.

I would be honored to discuss this proposal with you personally, and welcome your suggestions as to potential Beta test site institutions. Contact me anytime at (503) 754-1985. If I am unavailable when you call, please leave your name and telephone number. I will return your call promptly.

Thank you again for your time, effort, and participation in education research that may result in a new paradigm for employment evaluations and selections. I look forward to receiving your correspondence soon.

Respectfully,

Bruce J. Groll
955 Southeast Park Avenue
Corvallis, Oregon 97333-2135
(503) 754-1985, OSU 737-0921

Letter of Introduction

Please accept this invitation to participate in what may result in a significant new non-legislative alternative to achieving fairness, objectivity, and equal opportunity in employment evaluations and selections.

I am a Ph.D. candidate in higher education administration and Management Analyst for Special Studies at Oregon State University. I am at a critical juncture of my dissertation where I must obtain the assistance and cooperation of twelve highly knowledgeable professionals in Human Resources and Affirmative Action to participate as Delphi panelists in evaluating the traditional employment process, identifying the essential elements of an applicant screening process, and developing an anonymous applicant screening process for selecting the "equally qualified" finalists in administrative employment searches.

The purpose of this study is to design and pilot test an objective-based "anonymous" screening process for selecting the "equally qualified" finalist pool for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education. An anonymous applicant screening process will minimize bias and effectively eliminate the interjection of non-objective criteria in selecting the pool of equally qualified finalists. The results of this study will be pilot tested at selected public universities and evaluated in terms of the perceived fairness and objectivity in recruiting, evaluating, and selecting finalists as compared with current applicant screening processes.

Your participation in this effort is critical for completion of my dissertation, but perhaps more importantly, may result in a new paradigm for evaluating and selecting administrative personnel in higher education. I would be honored to have you on the panel.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to receiving your signed memorandum of acceptance to participate by **November 25, 1991**.

Respectfully,

Bruce J. Groll
955 Southeast Park Avenue
Corvallis, Oregon 97333-2135
(503) 754-1985, OSU 737-0921

Memorandum of Acceptance to Participate

September 15, 1991

Mr. Bruce J. Groll
955 Southeast Park Avenue
Corvallis, Oregon 97333-2135
(503) 754-1985, OSU 737-0921

Dear Mr. Groll:

- [] I accept your invitation to participate as a Delphi panelist for your dissertation research: **The Development of a Blind Screening Process for Selecting the Equally Qualified Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches.**

- [] Our institution is also interested in being considered as a Beta test site for pilot testing your dissertation research and may be agreeable to voluntarily implementing the blind screening process on a one-time trial basis encompassing recruitment through hiring in an administrative employment search.

- [] I am unable to accept your invitation to participate as a Delphi panelist for your dissertation research. However, I have read your prospectus and offer you the following critical comments and suggestions based upon my professional expertise.

Signature

Date

Dissertation Prospectus

**The Development of a Blind Screening Process
for Selecting the Equally Qualified Finalists in
Administrative Employment Searches**

A DISSERTATION PROSPECTUS

by

Bruce J. Groll

Submitted to Prospective Delphi Panelist:

Dr. Dean Sophistification
Vice President for Human Resources
Immaculate University
12345 Conception Avenue, Suite 911
Immaculate, Oregon 99911-0911

September 15, 1991

Abstract

This study is an empirical investigation of the education employment process. The purpose is to design and pilot test an objective-based "blind" screening process for selecting the "equally qualified" finalists for administrative employment searches in public higher education. Although extensive legislation, policies, and procedures have been promulgated to ensure that all applicants receive fair consideration, bias and unlawful discrimination in the education employment process continues. Surprisingly little has been done to change the employment *process* itself. The four procedural steps of this study are: 1) Identifying, using the Delphi Method, essential elements of the "traditional" employment process; 2) Identifying how the essential elements can be modified to accommodate a blind applicant screening process; 3) Pilot testing the blind applicant screening process at a minimum of one public college or university; and 4) Conducting a comprehensive professional assessment of the blind applicant process using a combined Likert scale and open response format questionnaire to evaluate participant's perceptions of equity, fairness, and objectivity. The results of this study will provide public education institutions an *alternative* applicant screening process that minimizes bias, substantially ensures equal opportunity and objective consideration to all candidates, and may be generalized to other educational employment categories and organizations.

Introduction to the Study

Overview

The purpose of this study is to design and pilot test an objective-based "blind" screening process for selecting the "equally qualified" finalist pool for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education. An anonymous applicant screening process will minimize bias and effectively eliminate the interjection of non-objective criteria in selecting the pool of equally qualified finalists. This process will offer public institutions of higher education an *alternative* employment process that substantially ensures equal opportunity and objective consideration to all candidates. The results of this study will be pilot tested at selected public universities and evaluated in terms of the perceived fairness and objectivity in evaluating and selecting finalists as compared with current applicant screening processes. The objective-based screening process may be generalized for use by other education employment categories and organizations.

Relevance to Education

A lack of understanding and non-compliance with the law as it relates to affirmative action and equal opportunity in employment continues to plague American higher education (Tatel and Mincberg, 1989; Arvey and Faley, 1988). While the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution's Fourteenth Amendment applies generally to employment discrimination by public institutions, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 specifically states that no applicant shall be discriminated against on the basis of gender, race, religion, color, or handicap (Kaplin, 1989). However, current applicant screening processes for non-tenured administrative employment are highly susceptible to personal bias, the interjection of non-objective criteria, and undue influence from internal and external sources in contradiction to this fundamental principle of equal treatment.

Surprisingly little has been done to evaluate or redesign the employment *process* itself to minimize bias. Consequently, bias and unlawful discrimination (the use of negative, exclusionary or limiting quotas) in the employment process continue to occur. Intent notwithstanding, we all possess inherent biases that influence our decisions. Federal and state civil rights and affirmative action legislation have been passed to mitigate these biases in the employment process, and public institutions of higher education have implemented specific policies skillfully articulated to address the same (Kaplin, 1989).

Affirmative action legislation mandates that public higher education institutions recruit qualified minority and women applicants to obtain demographically representative candidate pools (Day, Erwin and Koral, 1978). University policies and procedures have been promulgated to ensure that "all applicants receive fair consideration for employment on the basis of merit and fitness without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin or handicap" (OSU, 1989). These measures are only marginally effective in expanding the applicant pool, but ineffectual in depreciating inherent biases in the evaluation and selection processes (Hitt, 1982).

A different approach to screening applicants is critically needed in public higher education to ensure equal opportunity and objectivity in the administrative employment process (Dale, 1987). The development of an anonymous or blind screening process for public higher education to be used in the initial evaluation of applicants and selection of finalists will substantially ensure that all candidates are evaluated equally and objectively on the basis of specific criteria explicitly stated in the position announcement and job description.

Importance of the Study to Education

This empirical study will be helpful in describing the critical need in education for a different approach to screening applicants and in envisioning what that approach must include to assure equal opportunity and objectivity in the employment evaluation and selection process. The

development of a blind applicant screening process for public higher education to be used in the initial evaluation of applicants and the selection of finalists will substantially ensure that all candidates are evaluated legally and fairly on the basis of specific objective criteria explicitly stated in the position announcement and job description. A blind employment process will facilitate national educational affirmative action goals and socioeconomic reforms. Additionally, the responses and suggestions that emerge during the assessment phase may be used later in the design modification of the process for other education employment categories and organizations.

Review of Current Literature

A review of the literature was conducted to determine the severity of the problem of bias and discrimination in the traditional employment process and the extent to which American businesses, colleges, universities, and other enterprises are using a blind applicant screening process to address these problems.

This review integrates three literature sources. First, existing laws, statutes, uniform guidelines, and institutional policies that serve as the basic sources of authority are examined as they describe the legal framework within which a blind screening process must be implemented. Second, research articles found in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), dissertation, business, psychology, and social sciences data bases are cited in an effort to better understand some of the critical sociopolitical and psychosocial issues relevant to the proposed research, and incorporate these into the design of the process. Third, alternative applicant selection and evaluation processes designed to ensure fairness are critically examined to identify potential elements for inclusion, as well as procedural caveats, in the development of a blind applicant screening process.

Support for the Study

The need for empirical research into the development of an objective-based, blind applicant screening process has

been alluded to by numerous investigators who have chronicled evaluation and selection bias in traditional employment screening processes (Turner, Fix, and Struyk, 1991; Gerdes and Husted, 1987; Arvey, 1979). A review of the literature reveals that current applicant screening processes for non-tenured administrative employment are highly susceptible to personal bias, the interjection of non-objective criteria (eg. race, color, gender, handicap), and undue influence from internal and external sources. Consequently, many highly qualified applicants are unlawfully excluded and never reach the equally qualified finalist pool.

A recent report by the Urban Institute on discriminatory employment practices concludes that minority job seekers experience more difficulty in submitting an application for a job than their white colleagues. Overall, the study found that white applicants were treated more favorably in ten percent (10%) of the audits, whereas blacks were treated more favorably in only eight percent (8%) of the audits (Turner, et al, 1991).

Discrimination in employment is not necessarily intentional --- we all possess inherent biases that influence our decisions. Although comprehensive federal and state civil rights and affirmative action legislation has been passed to mitigate intentional discrimination in employment (Kaplin, 1989; Arvey and Faley, 1988; Day, et al, 1982), and public institutions of higher education have implemented specific policies skillfully articulated to address the same (OSU, 1989), discrimination in the employment *process* continues to occur (Turner, et al, 1991).

Recent employment studies focusing on gender- and race-related evaluation bias support the notion that between resumes of similarly qualified applicants, where one resume is known to represent a white male and the other a woman or minority, the woman or minority candidate will be evaluated lower than the white male (Turner, et al, 1991; Gordon & Owens, 1988; Mitchell & Henning, 1987; Hitt, 1982; Northcraft, 1982). Moreover, gender bias in evaluations are highly subject to effects of ambiguity, job sex-type, rater gender, and other non-job-relevant information (Turner, et

al, 1991; Johnson, 1989; Gerdes & Husted, 1987; Couch, 1981).

Studies regarding age discrimination in personnel selection conclude that under age-neutral conditions, managers preferred the older, more experienced candidate for the high-status job, but made less favorable decisions toward the older applicant when age was known (DeMille, 1989; Singer and Sewell, 1989; Cleveland, 1985).

Race, gender, age, and handicap discrimination in employment evaluation and selection are well documented; and anonymous applicant studies conclude there are no significant differences in the overall ratings for equally qualified candidates (Turner, et al, 1991; Northcraft, 1982; Couch, 1981). Despite these data, the development and use of a truly objective standardized blind applicant screening process for selecting the equally qualified finalists in educational, public or private institutions is nonexistent in higher education.

Methodology

The procedures that will be followed in conducting the investigation are presented under four major divisions:

- 1) Description of the "Traditional" Applicant Screening Process and Identification of the Essential Elements;
- 2) Preparation of the Instrument (Modification of the Process);
- 3) Pilot Testing of the Blind Applicant Screening Process; and
- 4) Assessment of the Blind Applicant Screening Process.

In Phase One, a review of the literature was conducted to describe the "traditional" applicant screening process and identify the essential elements of the employment process. With this information, a survey was designed to verify by consensus essential elements of the employment process identified in the literature. Using the Delphi Method, the survey will be administered to a diverse and representative group of at least twelve human resources and affirmative action experts.

Human resources and affirmative action experts from approximately forty-two, four-year public colleges and

universities in California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington with student enrollment greater than 5,000 head count will be identified through regional affiliates of the Association of Institutional Research (AIR), of which the researcher is a long-term member, and solicited by telephone as potential Delphi panelists. In addition, several known legal, human resources, and affirmative experts cited in the literature review will be contacted for possible participation.

Individuals who express an interest will be sent an information packet containing a description of the study, their expected level of participation and institutional commitment, and instructions and documentation required for the first round of the Delphi consensus building process. Also enclosed for their signature, will be a Memorandum of Acceptance to Participate. A follow-up telephone call will be made if a response is not received within two weeks of the initial mailing.

The Delphi panel's first task will be to affirm or revise the traditional applicant screening process described in the literature until consensus is achieved; and secondly, to affirm or revise the essential elements of the employment process. Steps describing the traditional process and the essential elements of the employment process will be modified or eliminated consistent with feedback received. Consensus will be considered achieved when at least nine of twelve, or seventy-five percent (75%), of the Delphi panelists concur with all the steps described in the traditional applicant screening process and all the essential elements of the employment process.

Using the affirmed "traditional" process and essential elements as guides, an objective-based blind applicant screening process will be designed with the overall goal of ensuring evaluative fairness and objectivity through applicant anonymity. In Phase Two, the Delphi method will be implemented to critically review and reach consensus on how the traditional employment process and the essential elements of the employment process can be modified, requested or presented differently, or eliminated without jeopardizing the integrity of the process to accommodate a blind applicant screening process.

Each Delphi panelist will be mailed a detailed description of a blind applicant screening process envisioned by the researcher. The panelists will be asked to critically review and evaluate the researcher's suggested process modifications for fairness, objectivity, and legality in terms of their affirmed essential elements of the employment process. Each panelist must also judge whether or not the suggested process minimizes bias to the greatest degree possible given the inherent limitations for precluding all bias in any employment process. Panelists will indicate in writing their full concurrence with the proposed blind applicant screening process or submit revisions that in their professional opinion are critical and necessary to obtain the stated objectives of the blind applicant screening process.

Based on the feedback received, the blind applicant screening process will be modified to incorporate their suggestions and recommendations. Subsequent iterations of the Delphi method will continue until consensus is reached. Consensus will be considered achieved when at least eighty percent of the panelists concur conceptually with the blind applicant screening process in its entirety and all other panelists agree to support the process. At this point, the final design of the blind applicant screening process will be prepared and copies sent to each Delphi panelist.

In Phase Three, the final design of the blind applicant screening process having been completed and consensus achieved, a pilot test of the blind applicant screening process in an actual employment search will proceed. Each Delphi panelist will be contacted by telephone to confirm agreement from at least one who has actively participated in the Delphi process that their college or university will voluntarily pilot test the blind applicant screening process on a one-time trial basis encompassing recruitment through hiring in an administrative employment search, and engage in a post-hire analysis in which the researcher will conduct a comprehensive professional assessment of the blind applicant process. The assessment will include a detailed questionnaire submitted to all available participants (eg., human resources and affirmative action officers, search

committee members, equally qualified finalists, and the person hired) to obtain their opinions and perceptions concerning the equality, fairness, and objectivity of the blind applicant process.

In Phase Four, following the hire, the researcher will send a follow-up questionnaire to all available participants in the blind applicant screening process including the affirmative action and human resources experts, the screening committee members, and the finalists, to assess generally their perceptions using a combined modified Likert Scale which shows both direction and amplitude, and an open response format which elicits qualitative feedback.

The researcher will develop and validate the content of the instrument used in the assessment process by reviewing the literature, analyzing existing instruments, and procuring professional guidance from three experts: one each from the fields of human resources management, affirmative action, and survey research. In addition, the researcher will offer all available participants an opportunity to informally discuss in person or via telephone his/her ideas and experience.

Each participant will be asked to comment critically on the areas of assessment (equity of process, fairness in treatment, and objectivity of evaluation) that may tend to support or refute the future use of the blind applicant screening process in administrative, and perhaps other, employment searches. Participants' responses are voluntary and strictly confidential.

Demographic profiles of each of the participants will be prepared, their perceptions recorded, and their responses summarized for future research.

Partial Bibliography

Arvey, R.D. and Faley, R.H. (1988) Fairness in Selecting Employees; 2nd. ed., Addison-Wesley, Inc., Reading, MA, ISBN 0-201-00078-4.

Day, V.B., Erwin, F., and Koral, A.M., Editors (1978) A Professional and Legal Analysis of the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures; The American Society for Personnel Administration, Berea, OH.

Gerdes, E.P. and Husted, V.L. (1987) Sex Bias in Evaluations: Effects of Ambiguity, Job Sex-Type, and Rater Gender; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Arlington, VA, April 9-12, 1987.

Kaplin, W.A. (1989) The Law of Higher Education; Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, CA, ISBN 0-87589-619-7

Northcraft, G.B. (1983) The Stigma of Affirmative Action: An Empirical Analysis; Arizona University, Tucson; National Institutes of Health (DHHS), Bethesda, MD.

Pettigrew, T.F. and Martin, J. (1987) "Shaping the Organizational Context for Black American Inclusion" Journal of Social Issues; v43 n1 p41-78, 1987.

Ravitch, D. (1990) Diversity and Democracy: Multicultural Education in America.

Reed, R.J. (1986) "Faculty Diversity: An Educational and Moral Imperative in Search of Institutional Commitment" Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership; v6 n4 p274-94 Win 1986.

Strossen, N. (1991) Columbia University Seminars on Media & Society Videotape, "Safe Speech, Free Speech and The University" Stanford University, CA; April 10, 1991.

Thomas, C.A. (1991) Senate Confirmation Hearing for Nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court, Washington, D.C., September 11, 1991.

Turner M.A., Fix, M., & Struyk, R. (1991) Opportunities Denied, Opportunities Diminished; The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Delphi Panelist Instructions

Thank you for agreeing to participate as a Delphi panelist for my dissertation research. This packet contains all the necessary information for you to complete the three phases of the Delphi process. It includes a brief questionnaire and the related outlines of the "traditional" employment process, the essential elements in the employment process, and the proposed blind screening process for selecting the equally qualified finalists. Supplemental application and evaluation instruments (Exhibits 1-4) are also provided for your consideration.

Please complete the Delphi Panel Questionnaire at your earliest convenience. Feel free to make notations on the document as you deem appropriate. Please return the document and completed questionnaire to me in the postage-paid self-addressed envelope by **December 16, 1991**.

If you have any questions or concerns about this process, please contact me, Bruce Groll, anytime at (503) 754-1985. If I am unavailable when you call, please leave your name, telephone number, and a brief message and I will promptly return your call.

About the Delphi process:

The Delphi process is a common qualitative research technique used to reach consensus among an independent panel of recognized experts in a particular field (eg. higher education law, human resources, and affirmative action). As a Delphi panelist, you will be asked to respond to a series of questions stating your professional opinion and to proffer suggestions regarding specific employment processes. Subsequent information about the design of the blind screening process will be sent to you that includes general information submitted by the panel as a whole. The intent is that the panel's responses will converge on consensus, inferring reasonably sound conclusions about the employment process. However, consensus is not essential as the Delphi process allows for justified differences of opinion rather than attempting to produce unanimity (Bowerman and O'Connell, 1979).

Your participation in the Delphi process will be three-fold:

1. To affirm the steps in the traditional employment process identified in the literature, which include Position Development, Recruitment, Application, Evaluation, and Selection. An outline of each step of the traditional employment process is provided. Please supplement this traditional employment process framework as you deem appropriate and indicate the sequence in which each step occurs in the process. If necessary, I will send to you periodic updates of the traditional process until the Delphi panelists conceptually agree on a basic structure.
2. To affirm the essential elements of the applicant screening process extrapolated from the literature as the position description, advertisement, affirmative action data form, letter of application, and professional resume or vita. A brief explanation of why each is essential in the applicant screening process will be provided with a flow chart. Again, please revise or append these essential elements as you deem appropriate. If necessary, I will send to you periodic updates of the essential elements until the Delphi panelists conceptually agree on what is essential.
3. To develop an objective-based "blind" screening process for selecting the "equally qualified" finalists for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education, using the traditional employment process and essential elements as a foundation. Enclosed in this packet please find an outline of a blind applicant screening process as I envision it, and the relevant supporting documents. Please revise or append the process and the documents as you deem appropriate to ensure fairness, objectivity, and legality. If necessary, I will send to you periodic updates of the blind applicant process and supporting documents until the Delphi panelists conceptually agree on a blind applicant screening process.

Thank you again for your time, effort, and personal commitment to the success of this research.

Bruce J. Groll

Steps in the Traditional Employment Process

There are at least seven steps identified in the literature that comprise the traditional employment process: 1) Position Development; 2) Recruitment; 3) Application; 4) Evaluation; 5) Selection; 6) Interview; and 7) Hire. A flow chart of the traditional and optional steps in the employment process are presented below (adapted from Arvey and Faley, 1988, p.8).

Position Development

job specifications: duties and responsibilities
objective criteria: required and preferred
experience and education

Recruitment

advertisement: extent and duration of search
sources and distribution

Application

application form
letter of interest and resume
affirmative action data
reference list or letters
college transcripts

Evaluation

meet **required** qualifications
meet **preferred** qualifications
meet **desirable** qualifications

Testing (optional)

detailed situational questions (5-7)

Test Evaluation (optional)

quantitative and qualitative analysis
Likert Scale 1-10

Selection

equally qualified finalists

Interview

Decision to Hire/Reject

Essential Elements in the Applicant Screening Process

A review of the literature suggests that there are only five elements which are absolutely necessary or legally required to be included in **any** employment process: 1) Position Description; 2) Public Notice or Advertisement; 3) Affirmative Action Data Form; 4) Letter of Application; and 5) Professional Resume or Vita. A flow chart of the essential elements in the applicant screening process are presented below.

Position Description

job-related qualifications: required, preferred, desirable
primary evaluation criteria specified
framework for position advertisement

Advertisement

communication of employment opportunities
basic institutional information
job-related criteria
application requirements
required by law

Affirmative Action Data Form

personal data:
name, race, gender, age, handicap, veteran
annual statistical reporting
required by law

Letter of Application

applicant's introduction to search committee
written communication skills
vital applicant contact information:
name, address, telephone

Professional Resume or Vita

chronological narrative applicant history
detailed job-related information:
experience, education, accomplishments
primary source of evaluation

Process Modification

- (2) How can the essential items identified in the Application Process above be modified to accommodate an anonymous or "blind" application process that would:
 - a. Substantially ensure objective consideration to all applicants.
 - b. Minimize biases including but not limited to:
 - 1. Evaluator bias
 - 2. Protected class bias (race, gender, age, handicap, etc.)
 - 3. External bias (supervisors, peers, interest groups, other public or private constituents)

- (3) How can Applicant Information be requested or presented differently from traditional means to successfully and legally achieve the employment goal while simultaneously ensuring objectivity and minimizing bias?

- (4) What data (eg. protected classes information) within the critical items identified above must be eliminated to ensure a fair applicant screening?

Outline: Blind Applicant Screening Process

The goal of this study is to design and implement an objective-based "blind" screening process for selecting the equally qualified finalists for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education that ensures fairness, objectivity and equal opportunity to all applicants. The outline of a blind applicant screening process that follows and the relevant supporting documents are provided by the researcher as a point of departure for Delphi Method analysis.

I. Position Development

A. Position Analysis

1. Conducted by college/department in consultation with human resources and affirmative action

B. Position Description

1. Duties and responsibilities specifically described
2. Evaluation criteria clearly identified
 - a. Primary (minimum *required* qualifications)
 - b. Secondary (*preferred* qualifications)
 - c. Tertiary (*desirable* qualifications)

II. Search Committee Appointment

A. Committee Members (five - seven individuals)

1. Made by appointing authority and college/department in consultation with human resources and affirmative action
 - a. diverse disciplines and experience
 - b. multiple reporting authorities
 - c. chairperson elected

B. Facilitator (one individual)

1. Assigned by Director of Human Resources
 - a. independent search coordinator
 - b. human resources staff person

C. Instructions

1. Discussion presented by human resources and affirmative action
 - a. goal, objectives, responsibilities
 - b. policies and procedures

III. Recruitment

A. Public Notice of Position Vacancy (required by law)

1. Advertisement designed by appointing authority and college/department in consultation with human resources and affirmative action
 - a. diverse geographic and demographic distribution
 - b. traditional and non-traditional sources
 - c. minimum notice: three weeks
2. Information
 - a. minimum required qualifications
 - b. application information / filing deadline
 - c. institutional commitment to fair, equal, and objective consideration of all applicants

IV. Application

A. Instructions (Exhibit 1)

1. Explanation of the Blind Applicant Process
 - a. goal, objectives, responsibilities
 - b. application procedures

B. Requirements

1. Letter of Application (three-five pages)
 - a. *specific* job-related qualifications narrative
 - o experience
 - o education
 - o major accomplishments
 - o professional development
 - b. job expectations and personal goals
 - c. social security number only applicant identifier
 - d. send directly to search committee chair

2. Professional Resume or Vita
 - a. *general* job-related qualifications
 - o experience history
 - o education background
 - o major accomplishments
 - o professional associations
 - o public service
 - b. social security number only applicant identifier
 - c. send directly to search committee chair
 3. Application/Personal Data Form (Exhibit 2)
 - a. detailed affirmative action information
 - o required: name, social security, position
 - o voluntary: date of birth, gender, race, handicap, veteran
 - b. data will not be used to discriminate against applicant
 - c. required by law for statistical reporting purposes
 - d. social security number only applicant identifier
 - e. send separately to independent search coordinator
- C. Receipt and Distribution
1. Letters of Application and Resumes or Vitae
 - a. received by chairperson
 - b. filed numerically by social security
 - c. unopened until application deadline
 - d. distributed equally among committee members
 2. Application/Personal Data Forms
 - a. received by independent search coordinator
 - b. filed numerically by social security
 - c. unopened until the applicant is eliminated or selected as an equally qualified finalist for notification purposes only
 - d. distributed to affirmative action after the hire

V. Evaluation (Exhibits 3, 4, and 5)

A. Primary (Initial) Applicant Evaluation

1. does the applicant meet the minimum **required** objective qualifications to be considered for the job?
 - a. NO -> drop from the candidate pool; send letter
 - b. YES -> evaluate further

B. Secondary Applicant Evaluation

1. does the applicant meet the minimum **preferred** objective qualifications to be considered for the job?
 - a. NO -> drop from the candidate pool; document why candidate was rejected; send letter
 - b. YES -> evaluate further

C. Tertiary Applicant Evaluation

1. committee members independently rank numerically each applicant by criteria
 - a. strengths and weaknesses documented
 - b. notations supporting the evaluation outcome (score)
2. candidate profile developed
 - a. independent scores are combined and totaled

VI. Selection

A. Equally Qualified Finalists

1. search committee identifies top candidates
 - a. based on profile totals
2. committee discusses profiles and relative merits of applicants
 - a. strengths and weaknesses from independent analysis shared
 - b. notations reflecting the discussion of each candidate
3. consensus vote to select equally qualified finalists
 - a. top three - five candidates
4. chair notifies independent search coordinator of committee's selection
 - a. candidates notified of selection or rejection
 - b. interview arrangements made

**The Development of a Blind Screening Process for Selecting the
Equally Qualified Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches**

Exhibit 1: APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

The application procedure described herein is part of an objective-based "blind" or anonymous applicant screening process used in administrative employment searches. The goal of this process is to ensure that all applicants are evaluated equally, fairly, and objectively regardless of their race, color, religion, gender, or national origin. The process is designed to focus exclusively on job-related qualifications and work experience through the selection of the equally qualified finalists.

All documentation submitted in application for the position of *Assistant Vice President for Administration*, exclusive of the Application/Personal Data Form, must include your social security number at the top of each page as the only designator of your identity. Use of institutional names, position titles, courses completed, workshops attended, or similar descriptors are permissible in the body of your Letter of Application and professional resume.

Letters of Application and professional resumes will be the only documents seen and evaluated by the search committee prior to the selection of the equally qualified finalists. Other documentation (college transcripts, teaching credentials, letters of recommendation, etc.) may be requested of the equally qualified finalists.

Please review the enclosed position description and evaluation criteria carefully.

1. Complete and mail the Application/Personal Data Form as per the instructions on the form.
2. Prepare a Letter of Application that clearly articulates your academic qualifications and work experience relative to the duties and responsibilities described in the Position Description and the essential, preferred and desirable evaluation criteria. Limit your response to five (5) double-spaced typewritten pages. Remember to include your social security number at the top of each page.
3. Prepare a Professional Resume documenting your education and work experience. Only your social security number should appear on your resume at the top of each page.
4. Mail your Letter of Application and Professional Resume to:

Dr. I.M. Inquisitive, Chair
Search Committee for Vice President of Administration
University of Innovative Technologies
College of Technological Obsolescence, Suite 911
Innovative, Oregon 97300-0911
TEL: (503) 765-4321
FAX: (503) 765-0001

**The Development of a Blind Screening Process for Selecting the
Equally Qualified Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches**

Exhibit 2: APPLICATION/PERSONAL DATA FORM

This Application/Personal Data Form is part of a "blind" applicant screening process. The process is designed to ensure fair, equal and objective consideration of **ALL** applicants regardless of their race, color, religion, gender or national origin, and focuses exclusively on job-related qualifications and experience.

Please complete this form in its entirety. The information will be used to meet state and federal reporting requirements. This envelope will remain sealed and your personal data unknown until either:

- (1) You have been eliminated from further consideration by the selection committee based strictly on the objective criteria specified in the Position Description;
- (2) You notify us in writing of your intent to withdraw from further consideration; or
- (3) You are selected as one of the equally qualified finalists (at which point race, color, religion, gender and national may be considered as an additional factor in the evaluation process).

REQUIRED

Social Security # _____

Name _____

Position Applied For _____

VOLUNTARY (Your decision not to complete this section will not subject you to any adverse treatment.)

Ethnic Group: ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
 ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
 ☐ Black
 ☐ Hispanic
 ☐ White (origin: _____)

Citizenship: ☐ U.S. Citizen/Permanent Resident
 ☐ Non-U.S. Citizen/Non-Resident Visa Status

Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male

Date of Birth: _____

Disability: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Disabled or Veteran: ☐ Yes ☐ No

(University of Innovative Technologies will make reasonable accommodations for otherwise qualified applicants. Please indicate on this form if you will need such accommodations in order to successfully perform the requirements of this position.)

Applicant's Signature

Date

Seal Here

Applicant Number

University of Innovative Technologies
Department of Human Resources
Administrative Services, Suite 1000
Innovative, Oregon 97300-1000

Postage Paid

Recruitment Coordinator for:
Assistant Vice President for Administration
University of Innovative Technologies
Department of Human Resources
Administrative Services, Suite 1000
Innovative, Oregon 97300-1000

**The Development of a Blind Screening Process for Selecting the
Equally Qualified Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches**

**Exhibit 3: EVALUATION FORM
Assistant Vice-President for Administration**

Social Security #

Meets
Criteria?

PRIMARY (Musts/Essential)

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. | Five (5) years of progressively responsible finance and administration experience in higher education. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. | Masters degree in business or public administration from an accredited college or university. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. | Business Administration experience in a college or university environment including fund accounting, payroll, purchasing, and indirect costs. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. | Responsibility for preparing and managing a departmental budget. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. | Three (3) years experience with spreadsheet and wordprocessing applications on micro-computers. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. | Three (3) years of supervisory experience of at least two (2) staff. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. | One (1) year of public contracts administration experience. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. | Experience in strategic planning including setting goals and objectives. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. | Experience designing and implementing management studies. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. | Experience using statistical analysis and sampling techniques. |

SECONDARY (Wants/Preferred)

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. | Doctorate in higher education administration. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. | Excellent written and oral communication skills. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. | Management of a professional staff. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. | Diverse higher education experience. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. | Experience using Federal A-21 reporting guidelines. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. | Experience in collective bargaining negotiations. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. | Facilities planning experience. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. | Experience recruiting, hiring, training, and supervising student workers. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. | Organizational skills and aptitude. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. | Professional development or experience in higher education law. |

TERTIARY (Desirable/Peripheral)

- | | | |
|--------------------------|----|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. | Participatory management style. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. | Total Quality Management (TQM) experience. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. | Management experience or training in multicultural environment. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. | Creative and innovative solutions to complex problems. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. | Assertive and self-motivated. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. | Scientific research experience in a laboratory or field environment. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. | Private industry work experience in a management capacity. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. | Exceptional human relation skills. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. | Intergovernmental relations experience. |

**The Development of an Anonymous Screening Process for Selecting the
Equally Qualified Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches**

Exhibit 4: CRITERIA MATRIX
Assistant Vice-President for Administration

		APPLICANTS					
CRITERIA:		153-01-0446	358-19-6234	418-33-8082	632-76-0013	754-72-2890	
		1	2	3	4	5	
<u>MUSTS</u>	5 yrs finance & administrative experience in higher education.						
	Masters degree in business or public administration.						
	3 yrs spreadsheet & wordprocessing micro-computer experience.						
	Management experience or training in multicultural environment.						
<u>WANTS</u>	Doctorate in higher education administration.						
	Excellent written & oral communication skills.						
	Facilities planning experience.						
	Laboratory or field research experience.						
	Private industry management experience.						
	Experience managing student workers.						
	Total Quality Management (TQM) experience.						
	3 yrs supervisory experience (2.0+ FTE).						
	Diverse higher education experience.						

APPENDIX B

**Four-Year Public Western Colleges and Universities
With Student Headcount Greater Than 5,000**

**Four-Year Public Western Colleges and Universities
With Student Headcount Greater Than 5,000**

ALASKA	CALIFORNIA	IDAHO	OREGON	WASHINGTON
<u>Research I Universities</u>				
none	UC Berkeley UC Davis UC Irvine UC Los Angeles UC San Diego UC San Francisco	none	OR State U.	U of WA
<u>Research II Universities</u>				
none	UC Santa Barbara	none	U of Oregon	WA State U
<u>Doctoral Granting Colleges & Universities I</u>				
none	UC Riverside UC Santa Clara	none	none	none
<u>Doctoral Granting Colleges & Universities II</u>				
none	none	ID State U U of Idaho	Portland St U	none
<u>Comprehensive Colleges & Universities I</u>				
U of AK- Anchorage	CA Poly San Luis Obispo CA State Bakersfield CA Poly Pomona	Boise St U	So OR State C W OR State C	Central WA U Eastern WA U Western WA U
U of AK- Fairbanks	CA State Chico CA State Dominguez Hills CA State Fresno CA State Fullerton CA State Hayward CA State Long Beach CA State Los Angeles CA State Northridge CA State Sacramento CA State San Bernadino CA State Stanislaus Humbolt State U San Diego State U San Francisco State U San Jose State U Sonoma State U			

APPENDIX C

Memorandum of Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process

Memorandum of Acceptance of the Anonymous Screening Process

Mr. Bruce J. Groll
 955 Southeast Park Avenue
 Corvallis, Oregon 97333-2135
 (503) 754-1985, OSU 737-0921
 FAX: 503-737-2400

Dear Mr. Groll:

[] I concur conceptually with and support the Anonymous Screening Process as presented in the final draft.

[] I agree to support the Anonymous Screening Process as presented in the final draft pending future implementation and follow-up assessment.

[] I do not concur conceptually with or agree to support the Anonymous Screening Process as presented in the final draft for the following reasons: _____

[] My institution is interested in implementing the Anonymous Screening Process on a trial basis encompassing recruitment through hiring in an administrative employment search and may be agreeable to participating in a follow-up assessment.

[] Additional comments and suggestions based upon my professional expertise: _____

 Signature

 Date

APPENDIX D

Delphi Panel Questionnaire Results

Applicant Information Matrix 1

The following matrix contains a summary of the numerical data reflecting the professional opinions of the Delphi panelists (N = 10) in response to a list of information items that may be required by an institution from an applicant before their application is considered to be complete. The matrix summarizes how frequently each item is required in the "traditional" application process and which information items are **essential** to the search committee for conducting a fair review through the three phases of evaluation criteria to selection of the most qualified finalists: Primary (meets minimum **required** qualifications); Secondary (meets **preferred** qualifications); and Tertiary (meets **desirable** qualifications).

Applicant Information		Frequency of Occurrence in "Traditional" Process					Item is Essential in Employment Process		
		Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary
a.	Letter of application	5	4	1			5	4	
b.	Resume or vita	9	1				9		
c.	Application Form	4	2	3		1	3	2	2
d.	List of References	8	2				3	3	2
e.	Letters of Reference	1	6	3			1	4	
f.	College Transcripts	1	3	2	2	2	1	2	2
g.	Essay Questions		3	4	2	1		6	1
h.	Writing/Work Samples		3	5	2			4	2
i.	Affirmative Action Data	7	2	1			2	2	

Applicant Information Matrix 2

The following matrix contains a summary of the percentages reflecting the professional assessment of the Delphi panelists (N=10) in response to a list of information items that may be required "always or frequently" by an institution from an applicant as part of the traditional employment process. The matrix summarizes the number of times each applicant information item is required either always or frequently and the corresponding percentage of the Delphi whose experience indicates this is so.

Also presented for each applicant information item are the comparative numerical data reflecting whether each item is essential in "primary or secondary" phases of the applicant screening process and the corresponding percentages reflecting the extent to which the Delphi concur in their professional opinions.

Applicant Information		Frequency of Occurrence in "Traditional" Process		Item is Essential in Employment Process	
		Always or Frequently	Percent	Primary or Secondary	Percent
a.	Letter of application	9	90%	9	90%
b.	Resume or vita	10	100%	9	90%
c.	Application Form	6	60%	5	50%
d.	List of References	10	100%	6	60%
e.	Letters of Reference	7	70%	5	50%
f.	College Transcripts	4	40%	3	30%
g.	Essay Questions	3	30%	6	60%
h.	Writing/Work Samples	3	30%	4	40%
i.	Affirmative Action Data	9	90%	4	40%

APPENDIX E

The Anonymous Screening Process

Position Description

UNIVERSITY OF INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Innovative, Oregon

POSITION DESCRIPTION

POSITION TITLE: *Assistant Vice President for Administration*

ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTION AND RELATIONSHIPS:

This assistant vice president level position is responsible for coordinating the financial, business, planning, and related support services of the university. The University of Innovative Technologies is a four-year comprehensive research university with an annual enrollment in excess of 16,000 full-time equivalent students and an annual budget which exceeds \$300 million. The University is located in the west central Willamette Valley in the Innovative area.

This position is responsible for coordinating the following areas:

- o Financial Services: Budget, Accounting, Cost Accounting, Payroll and Financial Forecasting
- o Planning: Institutional Research, Strategic Planning, and Facilities Planning
- o Information Systems Services: Operations, Systems Design, Programming, Educational Applications, Student Service Applications, Business Applications, Micro and Mini Computer Services
- o Facilities: Construction and Remodeling, Inventory of Fixed Assets, and Space Utilization
- o Buildings & Grounds: Custodial and Maintenance Services

This position reports directly to the Vice President for Administration. The Directors of Budgets and Planning, Institutional Research, Business Affairs, University Information Systems and Physical Plant, and designated clerical staff report to this position.

Assistant Vice President for Administration/P. 2

SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES/ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS:

1. Plan and organize the key financial operations of the University.
 - a. Advise the President and Cabinet in planning and coordinating the overall financial strategy of the University to finance programs and services on a multi-year basis.
 - b. Develop appropriate timelines, coordinate discussion forums, and reviewing processes for the annual university budget request and budget development cycles for operating and capital budgets.
 - c. Coordinate university budget requests and development processes with state offices and other state system institutions.
 - d. Integrate financial planning and capital facilities with strategic planning objectives and facilitate appropriate management information to support these decision-making processes.
 - e. Promote the financial needs and interests of the University at the local, state and federal levels of government.
2. Administer the overall information systems approach and direction of the University.
 - a. Plan and coordinate the integration of the University Information Systems' mission with that of the colleges and other administrative divisions.
 - b. Facilitate the use of planning and simulation models for analysis of alternative program decisions and related fiscal impact in operations and capital requirements.
 - c. Provide leadership in developing the information systems approach of the University in light of constantly changing technology.
3. Administer the overall space utilization, construction, remodeling, maintenance and custodial services of University facilities.
4. Oversee the staffing of the departments which report to this position.
 - a. Supervise the decisions made for staffing.
 - b. Recommend the employment, layoff, recall and discharge of personnel.
 - c. Transfer, suspend, reward, discipline and adjust grievances of staff or recommend such action.
5. Manage the overall operations of the departments which report to this position.
 - a. Evaluate directors and managers who report to this position.
 - b. Respond to employee and student complaints and take appropriate action.

Assistant Vice President for Administration/P. 3

- c. Assist the Vice President in preparing and administering the division budget, including the review and approval of all budget proposals from departments which report to this position.
 - d. Prepare and present reports and forecasts of activities and results associated with the departments reporting to this position.
 - e. Provide leadership in setting challenging goals and objectives for the directors and managers which report to this position and promote quality of work.
 - f. Promote and produce efficiency and effectiveness in all departments which report to this position.
 - g. Resolve interface problems between and among departments reporting to this position.
 - h. Represent the Vice President at designated meetings and maintain working relationships with other educational organizations, governmental units and branch campus area agencies.
 - i. Assist with labor contract administration.
 - j. Provide direction to directors and managers to facilitate an open climate which encourages staff communication for exchanging information, problem solving and interaction in a Total Quality Management (TQM) environment.
 - k. Provide leadership in the evaluation of administrative services. Provide recommendations with supporting information, data and staff opinion based on evaluation results to the President.
 - l. Be responsible for the supervision of directors, managers and staff who report directly and indirectly to this position.
 - m. Plan and execute with staff a program for professional development including internal in-service activities and appropriate external activities.
 - n. Assist with the evaluation of the University through cooperation with outside evaluation agencies and University evaluation personnel.
 - o. Assist with the evaluation of programs and services. Provide recommendations with supporting information, data and staff opinion based on evaluation results to the Vice President.
6. Perform such other responsibilities as may be assigned by the Vice President for Administration.

Assistant Vice President for Administration/P. 4

REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS:

- * Progressively responsible planning and budgeting experience in a major, complex organization.
- * Bachelor's degree.
- * Experience preparing and managing a departmental budget.
- * Strong background in planning processes and methods.
- * Strong background in organizational methods.
- * Experience with spreadsheet and wordprocessing applications.
- * Demonstrated proficiency in designing and implementing management studies including sampling techniques, information analysis and presentation.
- * Demonstrated capability in application of computer technology in planning and analysis.
- * Effective oral and written communication skills.
- * Experience supervising professional staff.

PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS:

- * Management experience or training in multicultural environment.
- * Master's degree in business or public administration.
- * Business Administration experience in a college or university environment including fund accounting, payroll, purchasing, and indirect costs.
- * Experience in strategic planning including setting goals and objectives.
- * Demonstrated capability in providing leadership for developing and managing university information systems in a constantly changing technological environment.
- * Demonstrated capability in administering the space utilization, construction, remodeling, maintenance and custodial services of University facilities.
- * Experience with Federal A-21 reporting guidelines.
- * Facilities planning experience.
- * Public contracts administration experience.
- * Experience in a union environment or collective bargaining negotiations.

DESIRABLE QUALIFICATIONS:

- * Experience hiring and managing a diverse workforce.
- * Ph.D. in higher education administration.
- * Total Quality Management (TQM) experience.
- * Demonstrated participatory management style.
- * Demonstrated creative and innovative solutions to complex problems.
- * Demonstrated knowledge of higher education law.
- * Intergovernmental relations experience.
- * Teaching experience at a college or university.
- * Scientific research experience in a laboratory or field environment.
- * Private industry work experience in a management capacity.

The successful applicant for this position should have demonstrated dynamic leadership attributes of diplomacy coupled with political knowledge required to move ideas through to completion, effective communication and human relation skills with populations of diverse socio-economic and racial backgrounds, vision, creativity, and organizational aptitude.

SALARY AND BENEFITS:

Salary is competitive and commensurate with qualifications and experience. Excellent benefits.

Notice of Position Vacancy

UNIVERSITY OF INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Innovative, Oregon

Assistant Vice President for Administration

The University of Innovative Technologies invites applications and nominations for the position of *Assistant Vice President for Administration*. This assistant vice president level position is responsible for coordinating the financial, business, planning, and related support services of the university. The University of Innovative Technologies is a four-year comprehensive research university with an annual enrollment in excess of 16,000 full-time equivalent students and an annual budget which exceeds \$300 million. The University is located in the west central Willamette Valley in the Innovative area.

The *Assistant Vice President for Administration* reports directly to the Vice President for Administration. The Directors of Budgets and Planning, Institutional Research, Business Affairs, University Information Systems and Physical Plant, and designated clerical staff report to this position.

Qualifications of the successful candidate will include:

- * Demonstrated dynamic leadership attributes of diplomacy coupled with political knowledge required to move ideas through to completion.
- * Effective communication and human relation skills with populations of diverse socio-economic and racial backgrounds.
- * Experience and skills in budgeting, financial management, strategic planning, facilities planning and organizational development.
- * Experience in higher education administration emphasizing creative and innovative solutions to complex problems.
- * An earned master in business or public administration is preferred. Persons with bachelor's degrees and related experience will be given serious consideration.
- * Demonstrated participatory management style in a Total Quality Management (TQM) environment is desired.

Salary competitive and commensurate with qualifications and experience. Excellent benefits.

Application Procedure

Applicants for the position of *Assistant Vice President for Administration* must obtain a comprehensive information, instruction and application packet. Please contact:

Independent Search Facilitator
Assistant Vice President for Administration
 Office of Human Resources
 University of Innovative Technologies
 (503) 765-0001, 9:00 a.m.-4 p.m. PST

The University of Innovative Technologies uses an objective-based anonymous applicant screening process. The goal of this process is to ensure equity of process and that all applicants are treated fairly and evaluated objectively regardless of their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or handicap. The process is designed to focus exclusively on job-related qualifications and work experience through the selection of the most qualified finalists.

Applicants will be required to provide:

- * A letter of application specifically addressing the essential job-related education, leadership skills, management style and experiential criteria.
- * A current resume or curriculum vita.
- * An University Application/Personal Data Form

All applications must be received by **January 31, 1992**. Applications will be held in absolute confidence among the search committee in evaluating your comparative qualifications to perform the essential functions of the job and to select the most qualified finalists. The *Assistant Vice President for Administration* is expected to assume the position on or before July 1, 1992.

Application Instructions

UNIVERSITY OF INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Innovative, Oregon

Assistant Vice President for Administration

The application procedure described herein is part of an objective-based anonymous applicant screening process used in administrative employment searches. The goal of this process is to ensure equity of process and that all applicants are treated fairly and evaluated objectively regardless of their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or handicap. The process is designed to focus exclusively on job-related qualifications and work experience through the selection of the most qualified finalists.

All documentation submitted in application for the position of *Assistant Vice President for Administration*, exclusive of the Application/Personal Data Form, must include your social security number -- or an alternate identification number assigned by the search Facilitator upon request -- at the top of each page as the only designator of your identity. The use of position titles, courses completed, content of workshops attended (eg., strategic planning, multicultural issues), or similar descriptors are permissible in the body of your Letter of Application and professional resume. Do not use institutional names, dates of employment, or other extraneous information that may reveal your race, sex, age, or handicap.

Letters of Application and professional resumes will be the only documents used by the search committee to evaluate your comparative qualifications to perform the essential functions of the job and to select the most qualified finalists. Other documentation (eg., professional references, situational questionnaire, college transcripts, teaching credentials) may be requested of the most qualified finalists.

Direct your questions or request for assignment of an alternate identification number to the Independent Search Facilitator for the Vice President for Administration at (503) 765-0001.

Please review the enclosed position description and evaluation criteria carefully.

1. Complete and mail the Application/Personal Data Form as per the instructions on the form.
2. Prepare a Letter of Application that clearly articulates and demonstrates your academic achievements, technical skills, and work experience relative to the duties and responsibilities and the essential, preferred, and desirable qualifications described in the Position Description. Limit your response to ten (10) single-spaced typewritten pages. Remember to include your social security number or alternate identification number at the top of each page.
3. Prepare a Professional Resume documenting your education and work experience. Only your social security number or alternate identification number should appear on your resume at the top of each page.
4. Mail your Letter of Application and Professional Resume in the pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope provided to:

Dr. I.M. Inquisitive, Chair
Search Committee for Vice President of Administration
University of Innovative Technologies
College of Technological Obsolescence, Suite 911
Innovative, Oregon 97300-0911

Letter of Application

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

January 8, 1992

Dr. I.M. Inquisitive, Chair
Search Committee for the Assistant Vice President for Administration
University of Innovative Technologies
College of Technological Obsolescence, Suite 911
Innovative, Oregon 97300-0911

Dear Dr. Inquisitive:

Please accept this letter addressing the required, preferred, and desirable qualifications in application for the position of Assistant Vice President for Administration at the University of Innovative Technologies in Innovative, Oregon.

I envision this position as a challenging career opportunity to blend my fiscal and managerial expertise with a broad knowledge of and experience in higher education. The university operates in a dynamic environment --- constantly changing to meet the increasingly diverse needs of society. The university is a critical link between K-12, technical, community and four-year colleges, private industry, and the community. It is within this environment and context that I desire to make a significant contribution to education and pursue my career.

My academic qualifications include more than ten years of diverse professional experience as a university administrator, an elected member of a comprehensive public school district Board of Directors, legislative assistant, planning associate, and researcher. I have had unique opportunities to work closely with educators, business and political leaders, and concerned citizens yielding a comprehensive perspective of the educational environment.

In addition to my present positions as Manager of Budget Resources and Special Studies at a comprehensive research University and public School Board Director, I am the Treasurer for the Pacific Northwest Association for Institutional Research & Planning (PNAIRP), and serve the community in a dual capacity on the Building and Finance Committee and the Intergovernmental Relations Committee comprising the school district, university, technical/community college, city, and county representatives. I also serve in varying capacities as University liaison to the Controllers, Budgets, and Facilities Divisions of the State System of Higher Education, private industry, and the education community, and as a consultant to other institutions in the State System.

Working in an international community, I have developed a strong appreciation for cultural diversity and the enrichment it brings to the education process. The compelling need for multiculturalism has evolved with and is underscored by a greater understanding of the socioeconomic implications that result from policies and practices that suppress open access and equal opportunity. I have been an active participant in several multicultural professional

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

development workshops including Equal Education Opportunities, Women's Ways of Management, and Managing A Diverse Workforce promoting a balanced understanding of the many critical issues of equal opportunity, fair treatment, and affirmative action.

These experiences have motivated a personal commitment to public service, life-long learning, and promoting quality education. In essence, continuous improvement through a comprehensive understanding of how the various education systems inter-relate with each other, with business, and with society as a whole. I believe an objective, broad-based educational foundation emphasizing critical thinking, cooperative problem solving, and communication skills is essential for the optimum development of our students in an increasingly competitive global environment; and that to meet the future needs of our nation, the university must continue to play a leading role in the American education system.

In demonstration of my specific knowledge, skills, experience and abilities relative to the Assistant Financial Vice President for Budget and Planning position, I submit for your consideration the following biographical profile:

PROGRESSIVELY RESPONSIBLE EDUCATION EXPERIENCE

My administrative career development in education has evolved and progressed along multiple paths, each with diverse responsibilities and insights:

- o Professional Higher Education Experience
- o Formal Higher Education Instruction
- o Professional Associations
- o Community Service

Professional Higher Education Experience

My professional higher education experience began in the Budget Office of a public comprehensive research university as the Assistant to the Budget Director. I was commissioned to design and implement a library cost study using sophisticated sampling and statistical analysis techniques, with supervisory responsibility for .50 FTE clerical support.

Subsequently, responsibilities were expanded to include intergovernmental reporting, management, workload and utilization studies, the Administrative Policies and Procedures manual, and budget preparation requiring exacting microcomputing skills with spreadsheet, wordprocessing and database management applications, and familiarity with two mainframe systems. Supervisory responsibilities included 1.0 FTE staff support person and six student library workers.

Within two years, I was promoted to Management Analyst and Budget Resource Manager with increased responsibilities for comprehensive cost benefit analysis of critical cost centers (Book Store, Central Stores, Purchasing, Computer Center), and compliance with Federal A-21 personnel activity reporting guidelines.

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

Three years later, I was promoted to Manager of Budget Resources and Special Studies with supervisory responsibility of 1.5 professional FTE management analysts, 2.0 FTE support staff, a .40 FTE student worker, and up to seven .50 FTE engineering graduate students hired to assist with special facilities studies. I manage a budget of approximately \$100,000.

Additional responsibilities include the Space Inventory system, Fixed Equipment and Improvements Other Than Buildings systems, analysis of the University's \$120 million state general funds budget, its related income budget and self-supporting activities, and presentation of an Executive Summary to the President's Cabinet on critical responsibility center budgets *v.* actuals. I also serve as a special studies consultant to other institutions and as University liaison with private educational consultants on special studies.

Major higher education accomplishments include:

- o Designed and implemented the Budget Status At-A-Glance report: a comprehensive monthly analysis and key management tool for Executive Administration of the University general fund and self-supporting account budgets totaling more than \$175 million.
- o Conducted the preliminary analysis and prepared the initial report of the Physical Facilities Condition Survey Report on capital maintenance, repairs, improvements impacting safety, access, and energy consumption; served as a liaison for university administration with Physical Plant Engineering, the State System of Higher Education Facilities Division, and private consultants in implementing the survey and in developing a financial plan to submit to the Legislature.
- o Designed and implemented an Organization, Systems, and Financial Analysis of the University Computer Center encompassing administrative, instructional, research, and auxiliary computing presented with alternative scenarios of actions and impacts; resulted in a fiscal and organizational restructuring which streamlined operations and enhanced University computing services.
- o Designed and implemented Library Indirect Cost studies at three State System Universities in support of their respective indirect cost proposals.
- o Conducted an Organization and Position Analysis of the Payroll section of the State System of Higher Education Controller's Division with recommendations for restructuring that mitigated personnel problems and resulted in greater efficiency.
- o Completed a comprehensive Organization Structure, Computer, and Data Processing Needs Analysis for Business Affairs encompassing general accounting, research accounting, accounts payable and receivable, payroll, purchasing, travel, student loans, and surplus property with recommendations for internal reorganization, the acquisition of additional microcomputers, and staff training; resulted in automated processes, increased accuracy, and improved efficiency.

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

- o Designed and implemented an University Stores Cost/Benefit Analysis comparing procurement costs of office supplies and equipment from outside vendors, the privately-owned University bookstore, and the State central stores with those estimated costs and potential savings of establishing a University Central Stores.
- o Negotiated a 20% savings on University purchases of supplies and equipment at the privately owned college bookstore yielding savings of more than \$170,000 annually.
- o Designed and implemented a Comprehensive Improvements Other Than Buildings study encompassing all above- and below-ground improvements (eg., curbs, streets, sidewalks, landscaping, water, sewer, electrical) on the central university campus with a combined total replacement value in excess of \$53 million.
- o Coordinated with private engineers, appraisers, and consultants the implementation of a Building and Fixed Equipment Study of major research facilities which supported and enhanced the University's indirect cost proposal.
- o Coordinated with private engineers, appraisers, and consultants the implementation of an Utilities Allocation Study which directly increased the returned overhead to the Physical Plant by approximately \$500,000.
- o Conceptualized and directed the design of an integrated Space Utilization Database System combining facilities use, personnel, and full-time equivalent (FTE) data for annual reporting.
- o Jointly designed the needs-driven Fixed Equipment component of the State System of Higher Education's Budget Allocation System (BAS) model for equitably allocating fixed equipment resources specifically earmarked by the Legislature.
- o Designed and implemented a Personnel Activity Reporting (PAR) System Audit and coordinated a formal staff and principle investigator PAR training program that identified and corrected System reporting weaknesses, increased reporting accuracy, and strengthened the University's indirect cost proposal.
- o Collaboratively developed solutions, an implementation plan, and measurement standards for increasing the accuracy of the Book Plan-making process as Total Quality Management (TQM) Team Leader of a cross-functional, inter-disciplinary team comprising facilities planning, physical plant engineering, budgets and planning, and research accounting.

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

Formal Higher Education Instruction

While working full-time, I attended the University part-time to earn a Doctorate of Philosophy (ABD) in Higher Education Administration. I also have a Master of Management degree and Bachelor of Science in Business Administration degree. Recent coursework that complements increasingly higher level of work experience includes community college administration, college and university teaching, student services, leadership development, higher education finance, and law of higher education.

Professional Associations

Professional association education experience includes current service as Treasurer for the Pacific Northwest Association for Institutional Research and Planning (PNAIRP), a professional association of 165 paid members representing 85 institutions from Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Alaska, and British Columbia. Responsibilities are managing and investing the Association's \$20,000 cash assets, preparing and presenting the financial statements, and serving on the Executive Committee. I am also an active member of the national Association of Institutional Research (AIR), National School Board Association (NSBA), State School Board Association, and have been active in the National College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) association.

Community Service

Community service education experience includes election to a second four-year term on the public school district Board of Directors. I serve as the Chairperson of the Building and Finance Committee and represent the Board on the Intergovernmental Relations Committee comprising the university, community/technical college, city, county and education service district, and the certificated and classified labor negotiations teams. As one of seven Board members, I have the joint responsibility for overseeing the management of the school district's \$38 million budget and 900 employees.

BUDGETS AND PLANNING EXPERIENCE

Experience in developing yearly operational plans and budgets includes six years as a member of the public school district Board of Directors serving on the Building and Finance Committee and the Budget Committee. The Board meets regularly in formal work sessions to set educational priorities and review financial plans that guide the District's management. Public meetings of the Board are held bi-monthly to confer with the Superintendent, District administrators, teachers, staff, students, and the community to solicit ideas, identify educational needs or concerns, and monitor progress in achieving our goals, objectives, and general directives.

At the University, I have for ten years actively participated in the financial planning processes and the annual operating budget and biennial budgetary processes. During this

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

timespan, my experience has included periods of extraordinary growth --- in terms of students, general funds, and sponsored research --- to the present desperate times of a 20% retrenchment precipitating program reductions, enrollment limitations, and personnel cuts.

Historically, academic and administrative divisions at the University have built their budgets to specific control totals specified by Executive Administration, but have expenditure flexibility within their budgets to the extent allowed by the institution. Academic and administrative division budgets are established each year through a prioritization process tied to the University's strategic plans and the division's operating plans.

Beginning base budgets are a function of the previous year's recurring base plus inflation for equipment, services and supplies, capital outlay, and any salary increases. This base is adjusted (plus or minus) for each division according to Executive Administration's allocation of funds and the alternative budget scenarios prepared by the deans and directors in consultation with their respective management teams. Alternative budget scenarios are "what if" budgets at various levels of funding (eg., base +5%, +1%, -3%) including program justifications and modifications at each level and the likely outcomes or impacts to the university.

Each dean and director formally presents and discusses these scenarios with the Vice President for Administration and the Budgets and Planning team. The Vice President for Administration, in consultation with the Director of Budgets and Planning, President, and Vice Presidents, determines each administrative unit's beginning budget for the fiscal year.

STRATEGIC PLANNING EXPERIENCE

As one of seven public school board directors for the community, I am jointly responsible for formulating the District's mission statement, for identifying the specific goals to be attained, for setting realistic time-lines, for clearly articulating the mission, goals and time-lines to the administration, for monitoring the progress toward achieving our goals through objectives set by the administration, and for ongoing assessment and adjustment, if necessary, to ensure continuous improvement.

I am an active participant in drafting and reviewing the mission, goals, and objectives for the University's strategic plan as they apply to the administrative units within the jurisdiction of the Vice President of Finance and Administration. I prepared the goals and objectives for the Budget Resources and Special Studies section and work closely with other section managers in developing and updating a comprehensive office strategy.

I have extensive training and practical experience in strategic planning models and related managerial tools including short-term and long-range planning, the ED QUEST planning model, Management by objectives (MBO), zero based budgeting (ZBB), planned program budgeting (PPB), quality circles, and total quality management (TQM).

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS EXPERIENCE

Effective management information systems ensure that decision makers have accurate and timely institutional data in a comprehensible and flexible format. I have been the key individual responsible for designing and implementing a monthly budget information system that provides the President and Executive Cabinet with year-to-date financial data on the twelve academic colleges and eleven administrative responsibility centers.

Additionally, we are in the second phase of implementing a comprehensive facilities management information system that links space inventory and utilization, fixed equipment, moveable equipment, HVAC systems, energy use, depreciation and replacement valuation, and personnel data bases to provide on-line up-to-date building profiles by room for planning, scheduling, building and equipment maintenance, indirect costs, insurance, and space allocation.

FACILITIES PLANNING EXPERIENCE

The Facilities Crisis in higher education is a major component of a national crisis we face in replacing, renovating, and maintaining our crumbling infrastructure of buildings, roads, bridges, water and sewer systems, and HVAC systems. An essential component of the facilities crisis as it applies specifically to a research university --- where it is necessary to be on the leading edge of innovation --- is modernization. Technological obsolescence of laboratory and instructional equipment and support systems often precedes useful life in the need for replacement to remain competitive.

I have actively participated in the process of carefully assessing the University's short- and long-term needs by conducting a comprehensive Physical Facilities Condition audit. This was accomplished using in-house expertise which I coordinated, and external architectural, structural, mechanical, and electrical engineering consultants to develop the institutional profiles that:

- o Documented and quantified specific projects by deferred, ongoing, or adaptive needs;
- o Prioritized projects in critical areas of health, safety, energy, and handicapped access;
- o Determined the degree of urgency associated with each project using numerical weighting techniques; and
- o Estimated individual project costs using generally accepted engineering techniques.

Remodeling and modernization of physical facilities typically falls within the adaptive needs of the institution, often motivated by significant health and safety concerns (eg. asbestos abatement, fume hood ventilation, protective barriers, toxic waste disposal). Facility remodels and modifications were analyzed and planned for in terms of future use, health and safety standards, building codes, and space utilization criteria.

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

INNOVATIVE MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE

I was assigned the responsibility of designing and implementing a cost benefit analysis to determine the fiscal and political feasibility of constructing a University Central Stores in lieu of continuing a de facto unrestricted policy of purchasing supplies and office equipment from multiple vendors throughout the community, at the State Central Stores some 35 miles away, and on-campus at the **privately** owned co-op college book store. The use of multiple off-campus vendors required considerable travel time and time away from assigned duties, although prices were competitive. Alternatively, the State Central Stores offered lower prices but orders required extensive paperwork, products were viewed by users to be of inferior quality, and delivery often took up to two weeks. The independently owned college bookstore, which has a long-term lease and is conveniently located on the central campus, is the major private beneficiary of University's business (approximately \$850,000 annually) ... at prices 15% to 25% higher than other local or central sources for identical merchandise.

The State administrative rules clearly state that ALL state agencies must purchase supplies and office equipment from Central Stores if they are located within 35 miles of the service area ... unless the agency can show a significant savings by purchasing elsewhere. We defined significant savings to include time, effort, and product cost. Technically, the university fell within the Central Stores service area.

I presented this scenario to the executive management of the college book store with the caveat that the University is in violation of the State's purchasing policies and may be forced to dramatically reduce or discontinue its purchases unless there is a legitimate financial basis ... The net effect of our conversation and subsequent communications is that the University now receives a 20% discount on supplies and selective equipment purchases at the college book store yielding an annual savings in excess of \$170,000. Additionally, other local retailers volunteered to initiate discounts for University purchases of lumber, hardware, paint, and other building supplies.

MULTICULTURAL EXPERIENCE

As a Director of the community public school district, I have had a unique opportunity to work closely with African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Native-Americans, and other individuals of diverse socio-economic and racial backgrounds. Consequently, I have developed an understanding of multiculturalism and a special sensitivity to the educational needs and concerns. Programs in which I have been directly involved include English as a Second Language, developmentally disabled, Parenteens, single working parents, and multicultural curriculum. Two years ago, I spearheaded an on-site district wide Early Morning Child Care program.

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

I recently researched and prepared a report, "A Chronology of Affirmative Action at the University," documenting national and State AA/EEO legislation and the subsequent higher education policies and procedures they mandated (from Title VII of the Civil Rights Act to the university's Affirmative Action Plan). Research involved working closely with the Affirmative Action Director, and coordinators of the Educational Opportunities Program, Women's Center, Communications Skills Center, Minority Scholars Program, and Upward Bound.

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PHILOSOPHY

The purpose of administrative services within a college is to have and clearly articulate a vision of the college's future and facilitate achievement of that vision through leadership and resource allocation; to ensure fiscal accountability; and to promote academic excellence and integrity. To achieve these purposes, I would use a participatory management approach drawing on my breadth of higher education knowledge and leadership skills and the depth of expertise of the University of Innovative Technologies' professional administrators and faculty.

Philosophically, leadership means to me integrity in both educational and management stewardship; it is humanistic, participatory, and situational; it requires technical mastery of the principles of management, personal integrity, and the recognition that people are our fundamental resources. I will meet regularly with the unit administrators and staff to communicate institutional needs and policy changes, and to encourage open communication of ideas and suggestions for improvement. I will treat each person with dignity and make a concerted effort to provide professional development opportunities. Successful management is a **mutual** commitment to excellence between the University of Innovative Technologies' leadership, its faculty and staff, its students, and the community.

I will take affirmative action to clearly define institutional goals and objectives with realistic timelines through strategic plans, and reallocate or obtain the necessary resources to ensure that these are acted upon. I will continuously monitor the pulse of the college using the appropriate tools of efficient management including strategic planning, program review, outcome measurement, demographic trends and fiscal analysis to ensure that critical needs are being met and that resources are being used wisely. I will strive for continuous improvement in all aspects of the college: instruction, research, technology, management, and community service.

555-77-2222

Assistant Vice President for Administration

PROVEN LEADERSHIP SKILLS

Drawing from readings and professional experience, there are ten leadership skills that I believe are necessary to be an effective Assistant Vice President for Administration:

- ▶ **Communication Skills** - the ability to exchange and clearly articulate ideas, goals, and principles across disciplines and keep constituents informed with a high degree of understanding and sensitivity to the abilities (eg., technical expertise, education, experience) of others.
- ▶ **Respect** - ability to nurture mutual trust, confidence, and loyalty of peers, colleagues, and subordinates through team building and involvement.
- ▶ **Vision** - the ability to create a team with a shared sense of foresight, imagination, and excellence.
- ▶ **Judgement** - the ability to exercise good judgement in critical decision making situations, releasing confidential information or opinions, using delegated authority.
- ▶ **Decision Making** - the demonstrated ability to make and implement decisions based on objective analysis and review.
- ▶ **Courage of Conviction** - standing up for principles that you believe in or know are true ... sometimes in the face of adversity.
- ▶ **Dedication and Commitment** - a self-motivated, sincere conviction to the organization, and individual excellence that may require personal sacrifice to benefit the common good.
- ▶ **Loyalty** - confidence in and commitment to subordinates in personnel and fiscal decisions, presentation of data, and times of personal difficulty.
- ▶ **Consistent** - constancy in purpose and in conveying objective, accurate, and complete information to peers and subordinates.
- ▶ **Sense of Humor** - the ability to smile in the face of adversity, not to minimize the severity of a difficult situation, but to put things in a lighter, more positive perspective with emphasis on opportunity for improvement and future success.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I would appreciate the opportunity to personally share my ideas, experience, and educational vision with you and the University community.

Professional Resume

555-77-2222

PRESENTATION OF QUALIFICATIONS

Assistant Vice President for Administration

Professional Experience

Office of Budgets and Planning

Manager of Budget Resources and Special Studies

Manage indirect cost and fiscal studies. Participate in University and State System policy formulation. Supervise the University's space inventory system. Analyze departmental budgets and prepare a monthly summary for the President's Executive Council, highlighting specific areas of fiscal concern and developing action plans for problem resolution. Serve as University liaison to outside consultants. Consult with other State System institutions in the design and implementation of special management and indirect cost studies. Total Quality Management (TQM) facilitator and team leader.

Office of Budgets

Management Analyst and Budget Resource Manager

Perform comprehensive cost benefit analyses of critical cost centers including the University Bookstore, Central Stores, Purchasing, and the Computer Center. Design and implement administrative computing and data processing needs and organizational assessments for Finance and Administration. Evaluate and monitor University compliance with Federal reporting guidelines. Coordinate faculty/staff federal compliance reporting workshops.

Office of Budgets

Assistant to the Budget Director

Complete intergovernmental agency management and fiscal year-end reports. Conduct management workload and utilization studies. Prepare Administrative Policies and Procedures manuals. Design and implement alternative methodologies for determining University indirect costs. Assist Director in all aspects of University budget preparation.

State Legislature

Legislative Assistant to Senator

Analyze proposed land use legislation and summarize legal briefs. Participate in strategic subcommittee meetings, policy planning sessions, and public hearings.

City Planning and Community Development

Planning and Community Development Assistant

Evaluate applications for the HUD Low Income Homeowner Repair and Weatherization program to ensure compliance with federal requirements. Write the Energy section of the City HUD grant proposal.

555-77-2222

Professional and Community Service**Public School District (Grades K-12)*****Board of Directors***

- o Building and Finance Committee
- o Intergovernmental Relations Committee

Pacific Northwest Association for Institutional Research and Planning (PNAIRP)***Secretary/Treasurer***

- o Memberships
- o Accounting and Financial Statements
- o Investments

Education***DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY*****Higher Education Administration*****MASTER OF MANAGEMENT*****Business and Public Administration*****BACHELOR OF SCIENCE*****Management and Political Science*****ASSOCIATE OF SCIENCE*****Resources Management**Professional Development

- o Total Quality Management (TQM) Facilitator and Team Leader
- o Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action in Higher Education
- o Women's Ways of Management
- o ED QUEST Strategic Planning
- o Grant and Contract Accounting

Summary

Ten years of experience in Management, Policy and Budget Analysis, and Higher Education Administration encompassing academic, government, and business environments.

Proven strengths in coordination of complex efforts, direction of personnel, and control of delicate interpersonal situations. Comprehensive budgeting knowledge in conjunction with analytical skills, knowledge and experience in computing applications, and organizational aptitude.

Background is marked by achievements in streamlining, cost savings, simplifying, saving time, and standardizing procedures.

Application/Personal Data Form

This Application/Personal Data Form is part of an anonymous applicant screening process. The goal of this process is to ensure equity of process and that all applicants are treated fairly and evaluated objectively regardless of their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or handicap. The process is designed to focus exclusively on job-related qualifications and work experience through the selection of the most qualified finalists.

Please complete both sides of this form in its entirety. The information will be used to meet state and federal reporting requirements. This envelope will remain sealed and your personal data unknown until either:

- (1) You are selected as one of the most qualified finalists;
- (2) You notify us in writing of your intent to withdraw from further consideration; or
- (3) You have been eliminated from further consideration by the selection committee based strictly on the essential job-related criteria specified in the Position Description.

REQUIRED

Social Security # _____

Name _____

Position Applied For _____

VOLUNTARY (Your decision not to complete this section will not subject you to any adverse treatment.)

Ethnic Group: ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
 ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
 ☐ Black/African American
 ☐ Hispanic
 ☐ White (origin: _____)

Citizenship: ☐ U.S. Citizen/Permanent Resident
 ☐ Non-U.S. Citizen/Non-Resident Visa Status

Gender (Sex): ☐ Female ☐ Male

Date of Birth: _____

Disabled or Vietnam-Era Veteran: If you are disabled, please describe the nature of your disability and how we may accommodate you. The University of Innovative Technologies will make reasonable accommodations for otherwise qualified applicants who can perform the essential functions of the position.

 Applicant's Signature

 Date

Seal Here

Applicant or Social Security Number

University of Innovative Technologies
Department of Human Resources
Administrative Services, Suite 1000
Innovative, Oregon 97300-1000

Postage Paid

Recruitment Coordinator for:
Assistant Vice President for Administration
University of Innovative Technologies
Department of Human Resources
Administrative Services, Suite 1000
Innovative, Oregon 97300-1000

Evaluation Form

Assistant Vice President for Administration

Applicant or Social Security #

Meets
Criteria?

PRIMARY (Musts/Essential)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Progressively responsible planning and budgeting experience in a major, complex organization.
2. Bachelor's degree.
3. Experience preparing and managing a departmental budget.
4. Strong background in planning processes and methods.
5. Strong background in organizational methods.
6. Experience with spreadsheet and wordprocessing applications.
7. Demonstrated proficiency in designing and implementing management studies including sampling techniques, information analysis and presentation.
8. Demonstrated capability in application of computer technology in planning and analysis.
9. Effective oral and written communication skills.
10. Experience supervising professional staff. |
|--|--|

SECONDARY (Wants/Preferred)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Management experience or training in multicultural environment.
2. Master's degree in business or public administration.
3. Business Administration experience in a college or university environment including fund accounting, payroll, purchasing, and indirect costs.
4. Experience in strategic planning including setting goals and objectives.
5. Demonstrated capability in providing leadership for developing and managing university information systems in a constantly changing technological environment.
6. Demonstrated capability in administering the space utilization, construction, remodeling, maintenance and custodial services of University facilities.
7. Experience with Federal A-21 reporting guidelines.
8. Facilities planning experience.
9. Public contracts administration experience.
10. Experience in a union environment or collective bargaining negotiations. |
|--|--|

TERTIARY (Desirable/Peripheral)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Experience hiring and managing a diverse workforce.
2. Ph.D. in higher education administration.
3. Total Quality Management (TQM) experience.
4. Demonstrated participatory management style.
5. Demonstrated creative and innovative solutions to complex problems.
6. Demonstrated knowledge of higher education law.
7. Intergovernmental relations experience.
8. Teaching experience at a college or university.
9. Scientific research experience in a laboratory or field environment.
10. Private industry work experience in a management capacity. |
|--|---|

Criteria Matrix

Assistant Vice President for Administration

Applicant or Social Security #

CRITERIA:	COMMENTS:
PREFERRED	
Management experience or training in a multi-cultural environment.	_____

Masters degree in business or public administration.	_____

Business Administration experience in a college or university.	_____

Strategic planning experience (eg., setting goals and objectives).	_____

DESIRABLE	
Experience hiring and managing a diverse workforce.	_____

Doctoral in education administration.	_____

Total Quality Mgmt (TQM) experience.	_____

Demonstrated creative and innovative solutions.	_____

Teaching experience at a college or university.	_____

Intergovernmental relations experience.	_____

Multiple Factor Tertiary Matrix

Assistant Vice President for Administration

Applicant or Social Security #

Criterion		Extent Criterion is Met (Scale: Low=0, High=3)	Weight Factor	Total Score
1.	Experience hiring and managing a diverse workforce.		x3	
2.	Doctoral in higher education administration.		x1	
3.	Total Quality Management (TQM) experience.		x2	
4.	Demonstrated participatory management style.		x1	
5.	Creative and innovative solutions to complex problems.		x2	
6.	Demonstrated knowledge of higher education law.		x1	
7.	Intergovernmental relations experience.		x1	
8.	Teaching experience at a college or university.		x2	
9.	Scientific research experience in a laboratory or field environment.		x1	
10.	Private industry work experience in a management capacity.		x1	
Applicant Profile Totals				

APPENDIX F

Assessment of the Anonymous Screening Process

Assessment of the Anonymous Screening Process

Overview

The development of the Anonymous Screening Process (ASP) successfully completed and consensus achieved, pilot testing of the ASP in an actual employment searches is highly recommended. The assessment will include a detailed questionnaire submitted to all available participants (e.g., human resources and affirmative action officers, search committee members, most qualified finalists, and the person hired) to obtain their opinions and perceptions concerning the equity, fairness, and objectivity of the anonymous applicant process.

Methodology

Each of the original Delphi panelists will be contacted by telephone to solicit and confirm agreement that their college or university will voluntarily pilot test the ASP on a one-time trial basis encompassing recruitment through hiring in an administrative employment search, and engage in a post-hire analysis in which the researcher will conduct a comprehensive professional assessment of the anonymous applicant process.

Once confirmation is received from three or more Beta test sites to use the ASP in an administrative employment search, implementation can begin immediately or as soon thereafter as a vacancy occurs. If less than three institutions among the original Delphi participants can be confirmed to voluntarily pilot test the ASP, other institutions will be actively solicited.

Following full implementation of the ASP through the hire, the researcher will send a Letter of Informed Consent and a Professional Assessment of the ASP questionnaire to all available participants in the process including the affirmative action and human resources experts, the screening committee members, and the finalists, to assess generally their perceptions using a combined modified Likert Scale which shows both direction and amplitude, and an open response format which elicits qualitative feedback.

The researcher will develop and validate the content of the instrument used in the assessment process by reviewing the literature, analyzing existing instruments, and procuring professional guidance from three experts: one each from the fields of human resources management, affirmative action, and survey research. In addition, the researcher will offer all available participants an opportunity to informally discuss in person or via telephone his/her ideas and experience.

Each participant will be asked to comment critically on the areas of assessment (equity of process, fairness in treatment, and objectivity of evaluation) that may tend to support or refute the future use of the anonymous applicant screening process in administrative, and perhaps other, employment searches. Participants' responses are voluntary and strictly confidential.

Specifically, participants will be asked to rate and comment on:

- a. the fairness of the process in treating all applicant information anonymously through selection of the most qualified finalists;
- b. the objectivity of the evaluation process and criteria upon which evaluations were based;

- c. the equity of the application process in terms of how it was administered;
and
- d. how the anonymous applicant screening process compares (favorably or unfavorably) with the "traditional" employment screening processes.
- e. whether the process substantially meet the dual aim of the Federal government's affirmative action efforts to eliminate the discriminatory effects of the past and to bar future discrimination.

Demographic profiles of each of the participants will be prepared, their perceptions recorded, and their responses summarized.

Letter of Informed Consent

Please accept this invitation to participate in the follow-up assessment of my dissertation research, *"Assessment of an Anonymous Screening Process for Selecting the Most Qualified Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches."*

As an active participant in a recent administrative employment search using the Anonymous Screening Process for selecting the most qualified finalists, you have an opportunity to participate in a follow-up assessment that may significantly determine the future and viability of this process. This is a critical phase in the evaluation of the ASP: assessing its fairness, objectivity, and equity. I respectfully request your voluntary assistance and cooperation in this important research effort.

The purpose of this study is to assess the viability and continues use of an objective-based anonymous screening process for selecting the most qualified finalists for non-tenured administrative employment searches in public higher education. The Anonymous Screening Process provides institutions with an alternative for evaluating and selecting the most qualified finalists that minimizes evaluator bias, effectively eliminate the interjection of non-objective criteria, and substantially ensure equal opportunity and fair consideration to all applicants. This study will further affirm the use of this objective-based screening process that may be generalized to other employment categories, educational organizations, and private enterprise.

Your participation in this effort is critical for assessment of the process, but perhaps more importantly, may result in a new paradigm for evaluating and selecting administrative personnel in higher education. More specifically, I am asking you to comment critically on the areas of **equity of process, fairness in treatment, and objectivity of evaluation** that may tend to support or refute the future use of the Anonymous Screening Process in administrative, and perhaps other, employment searches. Your participation is voluntary and your identity and responses will be kept strictly confidential.

I would be grateful if you would please take 30-60 minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the self-addressed postage-paid envelop **no later than January 1, 1993**. Moreover, I would be honored to meet with you personally or discuss over the telephone your perceptions and suggestions regarding the process. Please indicate your preference and include your telephone number on the questionnaire. I will contact you upon receipt to make the necessary arrangements that are convenient to your schedule.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to receiving your completed Professional Assessment Questionnaire soon.

Respectfully,

Bruce J. Groll

Professional Assessment of the Anonymous Screening Process

"Assessment of an Anonymous Screening Process for Selecting the Most Qualified Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches."

The purpose of this professional assessment is to obtain your critical analysis and perceptions of the fairness, objectivity, and equality of the anonymous employment process in which you were a recent participant. This assessment is a follow-up study to my dissertation research. As required by law, I must advise you that your participation is voluntary, and refusal to participate or to discontinue participation at any time will not result in penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your identity and responses will be kept strictly confidential.

Please take the time to complete your assessment thoroughly, and return it to me in the self-addressed postage-paid envelop **no later than January 1, 1993**. Your responses will be instrumental in providing general insight that may tend to support or refute the future use of the anonymous applicant screening process in administrative, and perhaps other, employment searches.

I would be honored to meet with you or discuss the anonymous applicant process with you over the telephone. Please complete the optional section (name and telephone) if you wish to discuss your perceptions and suggestions regarding the process with me personally. I will contact you upon receipt to make the necessary arrangements that are convenient to your schedule. You may also call me at my home (503) 754-1985, or at Oregon State University (503) 737-0921. **Thank you!**

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Name (optional):

Telephone Number (optional):

Institution (optional):

Current Position:

Current Salary: \$

Ethnicity:

Gender:

Position Applied For:

Salary Range: \$

Please evaluate the following five assessment variables as described and indicate your overall perception on a scale of negative three (-3) to positive three (+3), with negative three indicating a very negative perception and positive three indicating a very positive perception based on your professional judgement and recent experience in the anonymous applicant employment evaluation and selection process.

A. FAIRNESS: the fairness of the process in treating all applicant information anonymously through selection of the most qualified finalists.

Negative Perception	<----->					Positive Perception
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	

Your candid comments, perceptions, and suggestions on FAIRNESS of the anonymous applicant process as they relate to the following statements:

- o All applicant information is anonymous as to race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, and handicap from application through selection of the most qualified finalists.

- o Discuss how the **fairness** of the anonymous applicant screening process compares with the traditional employment process.

B. OBJECTIVITY: the objectivity of the evaluation process and criteria upon which evaluations were based.



Your candid comments, perceptions, and suggestions on OBJECTIVITY of the anonymous applicant process as they relate to the following statements:

- o The evaluation process is committee-based. Committee members independently assess each applicant's qualifications anonymously using specific job-related objective criteria.
- o The job-related experience, skills, and education qualifications are the exclusive criteria upon which analyses are based.
- o Discuss how the **objectivity** of the anonymous applicant screening process compares with the traditional employment process.

C. **EQUITY:** the equity of the application process in terms of how it was administered.

Negative Perception **Positive Perception**

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

Your candid comments, perceptions, and suggestions on EQUITY of the anonymous applicant process as they relate to the following statements:

- o A primary objective of the anonymous applicant employment process is to administratively treat all applicants equally.
- o An anonymous application and evaluation process provides applicants an equal opportunity to be considered and selected without bias.
- o Discuss how the **equity** of the anonymous applicant screening process compares with the traditional employment process.

D. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: the extent to which the anonymous applicant employment process facilitates the dual aim of the federal government's efforts to eliminate the discriminatory effects of the past and prevent future employment discrimination.



Your candid comments, perceptions, and suggestions regarding the anonymous applicant employment process as it relates to AFFIRMATIVE ACTION in the following statements:

- o The anonymous applicant employment process effectively "...eliminate(s) the discriminatory effects of the past" by providing a legitimate objective-based process for selecting the most qualified finalists wherein race or sex may be used in the final selection as an additional criterion in situations of under-representation.

- o The anonymous applicant employment process effectively "...bar(s) future discrimination" by ensuring, to the greatest degree practicable, the availability of an alternative employment process that is free of the inherent biases of the traditional employment process.

- o Discuss how the anonymous applicant employment process compares with the traditional employment process in facilitating equal employment opportunity and affirmative action in higher education administrative employment searches.

E. COMPREHENSIVENESS: the comprehensiveness of the anonymous applicant employment process in meeting the overall goals of equity of process, fairness in treatment, and objectivity of evaluation.

Negative Perception	<----->	Positive Perception
-3	-2 -1 +1 +2	+3

Your candid comments, perceptions, and suggestions on overall COMPREHENSIVENESS of the anonymous applicant employment process as an effective means for assuring fairness in application through selection of the most qualified finalists, objectivity of evaluation, and equality of opportunity for all applicants as they relate to the following statement:

- o The anonymous applicant employment process will provide institutions with a viable alternative for evaluating and selecting the most qualified finalists that minimizes bias, effectively eliminate the interjection of non-objective criteria, and substantially ensures equal opportunity and fair consideration to all applicants.

THANK YOU again for participating in the follow-up professional assessment to my dissertation research, *"Assessment of an Anonymous Screening Process for Selecting the Most Qualified Finalists in Administrative Employment Searches."*
